

STATE OF NEW MEXICO  
ENERGY, MINERALS AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT  
OIL CONSERVATION DIVISION

IN THE MATTER OF THE HEARING )	
CALLED BY THE OIL CONSERVATION )	
DIVISION FOR THE PURPOSE OF )	
CONSIDERING: )	CASE NOS. 11,297
)	11,298
APPLICATIONS OF EXXON CORPORATION )	(Consolidated)
_____ )	

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER HEARING

BEFORE: MICHAEL E. STOGNER, Hearing Examiner

Volume II

June 30th, 1995

Hobbs, New Mexico

This matter came on for hearing before the New Mexico Oil Conservation Division, MICHAEL E. STOGNER, Hearing Examiner, on Thursday and Friday, June 29th and 30th, 1995, at Hobbs City Hall, Commission Hearing Room, 300 North Turner, Hobbs, New Mexico, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter No. 7, State of New Mexico.

\* \* \*

STEVEN T. BRENNER, CCR  
(505) 989-9317

## I N D E X (Volume II)

June 30th, 1995  
 Examiner Hearing  
 CASE NOS. 11,297 and 11,298 (Consolidated)

	PAGE
EXHIBITS	176
APPEARANCES	177
PREMIER OIL AND GAS, INC., WITNESSES:	
<u>GERALD E. HARRINGTON</u> (Geologist)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	178
Cross-Examination by Mr. Bruce	207
Redirect Examination by Mr. Kellahin	212
Recross-Examination by Mr. Bruce	214
<u>PAUL G. WHITE</u> (Engineer)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	216
Cross-Examination by Mr. Bruce	231
Examination by Mr. Carr	234
Redirect Examination by Mr. Kellahin	235
<u>KENNETH C. JONES</u> (Owner, Premier Oil and Gas, Inc.)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	236
Cross-Examination by Mr. Bruce	250
Examination by Mr. Carr	254
APPLICANT'S WITNESS:	
<u>DAVID L. CANTRELL</u> (Geologist) (Recalled)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Bruce	258
PREMIER OIL AND GAS, INC., WITNESSES:	
<u>STUART D. HANSON</u> (Geologist)	
Direct Examination by Mr. Kellahin	271
Cross-Examination by Mr. Bruce	285
Examination by Mr. Carr	286
Redirect Examination by Mr. Kellahin	288
Recross-Examination by Mr. Bruce	291

(Continued...)

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS:

By Ed Heald, Unit Petroleum Company	292
By Bob Hodge, MWJ Producing Company	293

## CLOSING ARGUMENTS:

By Mr. Kellahin	294
By Mr. Carr	299
By Mr. Bruce	306

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	311
------------------------	-----

\* \* \*

## E X H I B I T S

Applicant's	Identified	Admitted
Exhibit 40	258	270
Exhibit 41	261	270
Exhibit 42	266	270

\* \* \*

Premier Oil and Gas	Identified	Admitted
Exhibit 1	184	207
Exhibit 2	190	207
Exhibit 3	197	207
Exhibit 4	200	207
Exhibit 4A	201	207
Exhibit 5	203	207
Exhibit 6	204	207
Exhibit 7	217	230
Exhibit 8	224	230
Exhibit 9	-	-
Exhibit 10	274	284

\* \* \*

## A P P E A R A N C E S

## FOR THE DIVISION:

RAND L. CARROLL  
Attorney at Law  
Legal Counsel to the Division  
2040 South Pacheco  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87505

## FOR THE APPLICANT:

HINKLE, COX, EATON, COFFIELD & HENSLEY  
218 Montezuma  
P.O. Box 2068  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2068  
By: JAMES G. BRUCE  
and  
SCOTT LANSDOWN  
Counsel, Exxon Company, U.S.A.  
P.O. Box 1600  
Midland, Texas 79702-1600

## FOR PREMIER OIL AND GAS, INC.:

KELLAHIN & KELLAHIN  
117 N. Guadalupe  
P.O. Box 2265  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2265  
By: W. THOMAS KELLAHIN

## FOR YATES PETROLEUM CORPORATION:

CAMPBELL, CARR & BERGE, P.A.  
Suite 1 - 110 N. Guadalupe  
P.O. Box 2208  
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87504-2208  
By: WILLIAM F. CARR

\* \* \*

1           WHEREUPON, the following proceedings were had at  
2   8:15 a.m.:

3           EXAMINER STOGNER: This hearing will come to  
4   order, consolidated Cases 11,297 and 11,298.

5           At this time I believe we're ready to start with  
6   you, Mr. Kellahin, Premier Oil.

7           MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you, Mr. Examiner. We're  
8   ready to proceed.

9           Call at this time our first witness, Mr. Jerry  
10   Harrington. Mr. Harrington is a consulting geologist. He  
11   resides in Roswell, New Mexico.

12          EXAMINER STOGNER: May I remind all the witness  
13   here today that they have been previously sworn yesterday  
14   and remain under oath today in the proceedings.

15          MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you, Mr. Examiner.

16                   GERALD E. HARRINGTON,  
17   the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon  
18   his oath, was examined and testified as follows:

19                   DIRECT EXAMINATION

20   BY MR. KELLAHIN:

21           Q.   Mr. Harrington, for the record, sir, would you  
22   please state your name and occupation?

23           A.   My name is Gerald E. Harrington. I'm a  
24   geological consultant.

25           Q.   Where do you reside, sir?

1           A.    My residence is Roswell, New Mexico.

2           Q.    Would you summarize for us your education and  
3 employment experience?

4           A.    I received a bachelor of science degree in  
5 petroleum geology from the University of Oklahoma in 1953.  
6 Following two years of military service, I was employed by  
7 the Old Pacific Northwest Pipeline in the San Juan Basin  
8 and worked the southern and mid-Rockies for a number of  
9 years and in 1963 moved to Roswell and have worked in the  
10 Roswell area for various independent operators, as well as  
11 Atlantic Richfield for a short period of time, and have  
12 been a consultant since 1973.

13          Q.    As part of your current consulting duties as a  
14 professional geologist, are you currently employed by  
15 Premier Oil and Gas, Inc.?

16          A.    Yes, I am.

17          Q.    As part of that employment, have you made an  
18 independent geologic investigation, particularly of the  
19 Delaware formation, insofar as it affects the Premier  
20 property, which is the subject of this hearing and is  
21 identified as Tract 6 within the proposed statutory unit?

22          A.    Yes, I have.

23          Q.    And as part of that study, have you now come to  
24 certain geologic conclusions with regards to that property?

25          A.    Yes, I have.

1 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, we tender Mr.  
2 Harrington as an expert petroleum geologist.

3 EXAMINER STOGNER: Are there any objections?

4 I take that as a no, so Mr. Harrington is so  
5 qualified.

6 Q. (By Mr. Kellahin) Mr. Harrington, give us a  
7 sense of how you went about the work that you're about to  
8 present here, in terms of initiating a study. What were  
9 you asked to do?

10 A. I was asked by Premier Oil and Gas to evaluate  
11 the potential for the Delaware Mountain Group on the  
12 acreage that they owned in Section 25 of Township 20 South,  
13 Range 27 East.

14 Q. At the time that you were asked to commence that  
15 study, were you provided a copy of the geologic  
16 interpretation conducted and presented by Exxon today?

17 A. Not initially.

18 Q. Initially, when you were asked to perform a  
19 geologic evaluation for Premier, were you given any set of  
20 parameters, limitations or any kind of conditions on any  
21 conclusions that you might form?

22 A. The specific request from Dr. Jones was that I  
23 make an independent evaluation of the potential for the  
24 Delaware on the Premier oil and gas acreage.

25 Q. All right, sir. Describe for us the method you

1 used. How did you go about this?

2 A. I utilized the materials available from the  
3 Roswell Energy Library comprising logs, scout tickets,  
4 production information, et cetera, and attempted to use  
5 that data to compile my study and construct cross-sections,  
6 to determine the limits of the Upper Cherry Canyon and the  
7 Brushy Basin reservoir.

8 Q. Let's focus on the Upper Cherry Canyon reservoir.

9 A. That was the primary objective.

10 Q. All right. Let's focus on that for our  
11 discussion here this morning.

12 How did you as a geologist make geologic  
13 decisions in order to determine what in your opinion was  
14 the limits of that reservoir, insofar as it affected the  
15 Premier tracts?

16 A. I utilized the logs that were available and  
17 correlations that were made by myself, and based in part on  
18 previous experience with the Delaware Mountain Group and  
19 the general area.

20 Q. And were you able to satisfy yourself that you  
21 could make appropriate correlations between these logs, map  
22 the reservoir and come to geologic conclusions?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. And what was your conclusion?

25 A. My conclusion was that there -- that I -- after



1 constructing the cross-sections, that there was a  
2 difference, after subsequently receiving copies of the  
3 technical reports, there was a discrepancy between what I  
4 had picked as the intervals for the Cherry Canyon, compared  
5 to what Exxon had compared and compiled in the technical  
6 report.

7 Q. All right. The difference is not a difference in  
8 what you're using for markers, it's where you put those  
9 markers?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. The nomenclature that Exxon has used in the  
12 presentation yesterday, that's the convention down here, is  
13 it not?

14 A. It's not the exact terminology that I've used in  
15 the past, but it is acceptable.

16 Q. All right. And so when we begin to talk about  
17 the base of the Goat Seep Reef, the Upper Cherry Canyon  
18 top, this Upper Cherry Canyon middle and then the Cherry  
19 Canyon Upper base, those are all going to be terms that are  
20 well known to you and other geologists in this area?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Are there identifiable indications on these  
23 various logs by which you're able to correlate those  
24 various markers from well to well?

25 A. Yes, I've utilized in my studies primarily a

1 pattern analysis for the curves presented on open-hole or  
2 wireline logs.

3 Q. As a result of your study, then, you subsequently  
4 reviewed the Exxon geologic information?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And you were aware at that point, then, there's a  
7 difference between the Exxon interpretation and your  
8 interpretation, insofar as it affects the Premier tracts?

9 A. That's correct.

10 Q. Summarize for us your recollection of what Exxon  
11 has determined to be the net pay thickness in the Upper  
12 Cherry Canyon reservoir insofar as it affects the FV3 well.

13 A. In the Exxon technical report, they attributed --  
14 I'm going to have to refer to another exhibit.

15 Q. Perhaps I can refresh your memory. I believe  
16 it's 55 feet.

17 A. Yes, I believe that was correct. And the  
18 correlations that I have made have indicated to me, to my  
19 satisfaction, that the base of the Cherry Canyon pick was  
20 incorrect and that it in effect added a significant  
21 thickness to the Cherry Canyon reservoir.

22 Q. As a result of your calculation, an additional  
23 net feet of 82 feet of net pay should be added to this  
24 well?

25 A. That's correct.

1           Q.    When you take that information, then, were you  
2   able to construct a thickness map, an isopach of some  
3   configuration with regards to the Upper Cherry Canyon  
4   reservoir?

5           A.    After receiving the technical report, I attempted  
6   then -- or not only attempted but did construct an isopach  
7   of the same interval that was shown on an isopach presented  
8   in the technical report.

9           Q.    After preparation of the isopach, did you prepare  
10  any other geologic maps?

11          A.    Yes, there was one other map which I constructed  
12  that indicated the net hydrocarbon porosity thickness.

13          Q.    Did you work in association with Paul White, a  
14  reservoir engineer, in determining the appropriate values  
15  by which to construct the hydrocarbon pore volume map that  
16  you're about to show us?

17          A.    Yes.

18          Q.    Let's go to the first display, then, and have you  
19  identify for us where -- And let's start with the FV well  
20  on Exhibit Number 1.  It's on the board there.

21                Let's start with the FV3 well, identify the  
22  markers, and then demonstrate to us the difference in that  
23  log as to your conclusions and the Exxon interpretation.

24          A.    As shown on the cross-section A-A', the section  
25  runs from the Antwell Mesa Macho well, an offset to the

1 north of the Premier acreage, southward through the FV1  
2 well. Next well in line is the FV2, and the fourth well  
3 from the north is the FV3 well, and then subsequently, on  
4 to the Yates Citadel ZG Number 1, which is an offset to the  
5 south.

6 Q. All right. Let's start with the second well from  
7 the right, then, the FV3, and starting at the top down,  
8 indicate to us what's happening with these different  
9 markers and how you've identified them with the color code.

10 A. On the cross-section, the datums that I have  
11 picked are identified in black, and the datums that were  
12 utilized in the technical report are indicated by the red  
13 dashed lines for the base of the Goat Seep Reef or the top  
14 of the Cherry Canyon member of the Delaware Mountain.  
15 Subsequent -- Moving on down the section --

16 Q. Well, stop there for a moment, Mr. Harrington.

17 A. Okay.

18 Q. Is there any material difference between your  
19 interpretation and Exxon's with regards to where to put  
20 that top insofar as it's interpreted on the FV well log?

21 A. Yes, a slight difference in the matter of  
22 essentially 20 -- well, about 18 or 19 feet. My pick is  
23 about 19 feet higher than what Exxon had picked.

24 Q. Show us what has indicated to you on that log  
25 where you have found the Upper Cherry Canyon top to be.

1           A.    I essentially used the gamma-ray increase in peak  
2   that shows -- which I can't see from here.  That gamma-  
3   ray -- increase in gamma-ray radiation indicated at a depth  
4   of 2483, and the top that was utilized by Exxon in their  
5   technical report is at 2503.

6           Q.    All right, that's in the FV1?

7           A.    No, this is the -- I beg your pardon, you're  
8   correct.

9           Q.    Yeah.  And so as we move over to the FV3, looking  
10   at the second log from the right, is there a material  
11   difference between you and Exxon in where both of you are  
12   picking the Upper Cherry Canyon top?

13          A.    No.

14          Q.    As we move down, then, to the next marker point,  
15   show us what's picked then.

16          A.    The next marker that is selected and used in the  
17   technical report is the Upper Cherry Canyon Downlap  
18   section, and the pick that Exxon has made is at 25- -- I  
19   believe it's -88.

20          Q.    And it would be the red line --

21          A.    That's correct.

22          Q.    -- just below -- just above the numbers "2600" on  
23   the exhibit?

24          A.    That's correct.

25          Q.    All right.  That does not agree with your pick of

1 the Upper Cherry Canyon Downlap, does it?

2 A. No, it does not.

3 Q. You pick it higher, don't you?

4 A. That's correct.

5 Q. Show us where you put it.

6 A. The correlation that I have made puts the top of  
7 the Upper Cherry Canyon Downlap section at a point -- Let's  
8 see, 2546.

9 Since this is on a two-inch-per-hundred-foot  
10 scale, I used the 2-1/2-inch for -- or 5-1/2-inch for the  
11 tops and the -- but for display purposes used this scale.  
12 And the top that I picked, as I say, is at 2546.

13 Q. What caused you to make the pick of that marker  
14 point at that location? What was the number? 25- -- What?

15 A. 2546.

16 Q. At 2546 what do you see on that log that caused  
17 you as an expert geologist to put that marker at that  
18 point?

19 A. Once again, utilizing the character, the profile  
20 of the curve presented on the log, the gamma-ray as well as  
21 the porosity curves and density-neutron.

22 Q. If you put it at 2546, you must have concluded  
23 that Exxon's wrong by putting it lower?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. What's occurring at the point where they have put

1 that marker?

2 A. They have apparently selected a radioactivity  
3 peak as opposed to a change in character, general change in  
4 character of the curve.

5 Q. And you would disagree with that?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. All right, let's go down to the next marker  
8 point. What's that?

9 A. The next marker is the Upper Cherry Canyon  
10 middle, as identified in the technical report.

11 Q. All right. Is there any material difference of  
12 opinion between you and Exxon as to where to put that  
13 marker point in this well log?

14 A. No.

15 Q. All right. What's the next marker point?

16 A. The next marker point is the Upper Cherry Canyon  
17 base.

18 Q. All right. Where do you put the Upper Cherry  
19 Canyon base?

20 A. The base pick that I've made, based on log  
21 character analysis, is 2852.

22 Q. What caused you to put that marker point at 2852?

23 A. The consistency of the curves over the interval  
24 that was examined.

25 Q. What curves are you looking at to form the

1 opinion of consistency?

2 A. All the curves, the -- including the caliper, the  
3 gamma-ray, the neutron and the density curves.

4 Q. Exxon's placed that marker point substantially  
5 higher on the log of this well than you have?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. Where have they put it?

8 A. They put it at a depth of 27- -- I believe it's  
9 2769.

10 Q. What do you see at the log at that point, where  
11 Exxon placed that marker?

12 A. A radioactive -- an increase in radioactivity on  
13 gamma ray.

14 Q. Would you have used that information from the log  
15 to indicate that marker point?

16 A. Only insofar as it is a part of the log character  
17 comparison that I have made.

18 Q. As to Exxon's pick, though, do you disagree with  
19 their pick?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And what's wrong with their pick?

22 A. Their pick is inconsistent with the correlations  
23 with additional logs in the area.

24 Q. Let's look, then, at that correlation. Now that  
25 you've set the framework for the difference, show us how



1 your interpretation fits with the other logs in the area.

2 A. For all intents and purposes, the interval from  
3 the middle Cherry Canyon to the Upper Cherry Canyon base is  
4 consistent to the north from the FV3 well.

5 But when you go to the south and you include the  
6 FV3 and the Yates Citadel ZG 1, I find a substantial  
7 difference between the interval that Exxon has demonstrated  
8 in their technical report and what I have concluded.

9 Q. In your opinion, are your log picks for the FV3  
10 well consistent, then, with correlating markers of those  
11 correlative intervals in the other wells on the cross-  
12 section?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. All right, sir, let's go to the next display.

15 In reviewing the Exxon geologic data submitted to  
16 you for review, were you able to find a cross-section that  
17 they had prepared that put the FV3 well in the same cross-  
18 section with the offsetting well to the east, the MW4?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Did you construct your own cross-section, then,  
21 with those two wells?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Is that what we're looking at when we see Number  
24 2, Exhibit 2?

25 A. Exhibit 2, cross-section B-B'.

1 Q. Summarize for us what you've done.

2 A. Essentially what I've done with this cross-  
3 section is to indicate the curve pattern analysis that I've  
4 utilized to arrive at the conclusion that I have in the  
5 Upper Cherry Canyon.

6 Q. Why is that a method utilized by you as a  
7 geologist?

8 A. I find that it's more consistent with regional  
9 patterns of the development in the Cherry Canyon, in the  
10 general area.

11 Q. When you talk about a log curve analysis or  
12 comparison, what are you saying?

13 A. I'm saying we're looking for similarities in  
14 curve character between wells, between the logs of the  
15 well.

16 Q. And how does that help you?

17 A. And that helps me to identify specific units  
18 within a given formation.

19 Q. A specific unit of a reservoir in one log ought  
20 to have the same curve or character in an adjoining log, if  
21 they are correlative?

22 A. Similar. Not necessarily identical, because of  
23 changes in lithology.

24 Q. And that's where you're supposed to apply your  
25 expertise as a geologist?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Is this the kind of thing you regularly do on a  
3 routine basis?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Are these hard markers to find?

6 A. Not particularly.

7 Q. Was this a difficult correlation?

8 A. No.

9 Q. Is this such a sophisticated, tedious task that  
10 you and others would have substantial disagreement on how  
11 to do it?

12 A. No, I wouldn't think so, no.

13 Q. Okay. Describe for us what you see, then, when  
14 you correlate the FV3 back to the WM4 in terms of this log  
15 curve comparison.

16 A. Essentially, there are two differences, one of  
17 which is the Upper Cherry Canyon Downlap pick, and then  
18 also the base of the Cherry Canyon pick.

19 Q. Again, your points here are in black, and the  
20 Exxon interpretation are the red dashed lines?

21 A. That's correct.

22 Q. All right. Show us what you see.

23 A. Essentially, the change in character is indicated  
24 -- the Downlap interval to be of significantly -- but not  
25 consequentially, but significantly different from what was

1 picked by Exxon.

2 But the significance does show up primarily in  
3 the base of the Cherry Canyon pick, whereby I have  
4 concluded that there is an additional gross interval of 84  
5 feet that was not included in the interval that was  
6 reported in the technical report. Of that 84 feet, we've  
7 determined that we have potential for a net 82 feet of  
8 potential pay in the Upper Cherry Canyon.

9 Q. To get the net, you're using the same 10-percent  
10 porosity cutoff value that Exxon used?

11 A. We used the same parameters used by Exxon in  
12 their preparation of the technical report.

13 Q. All right. Have you color-coded Exhibit Number 2  
14 so that we could see your interpretation of these log curve  
15 comparisons?

16 A. Yes, I have.

17 Q. My copy is not marked like yours, Jerry. Did you  
18 do that to the other copies?

19 A. Yes.

20 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, is yours coded?

21 EXAMINER STOGNER: Yes, it is.

22 Q. (By Mr. Kellahin) All right, sir.

23 Take us through the color code, then, and show  
24 us, Mr. Harrington, what it is about these two logs that  
25 gives you this conclusion about the similarity.

1           A.    The interval that was demonstrated on the cross-  
2 sections included a marker, which is rather prevalent and  
3 predominant throughout the analog field area.

4                   Working upward from that, I then identify  
5 specific characters and attempt to relate them to what I  
6 have determined for the FV3, to see if we have a similarity  
7 in log character in the WM4 offset to the east, and have  
8 carried this analysis -- this particular procedure -- on  
9 upward to the Upper Cherry Canyon base, and then in  
10 addition, working with the intervals above, utilizing the  
11 same curve pattern analysis, have determined that my picks  
12 for these intervals that I have shown that are the four,  
13 and my pick for the Cherry Canyon marker, five specific  
14 tops that I have utilized in this cross-section.

15           Q.    All right. Take us from the bottom and show us  
16 the color code and show us why you believe those curves can  
17 be correlated in that fashion.

18           A.    I don't think there's any question about the  
19 correlation, starting with the Cherry Canyon marker where  
20 it is -- the log character is so similar that there's no  
21 doubt, no question.

22           Q.    Let's move up to the next interval, then.

23           A.    Then next interval shows an increase in porosity  
24 as determined by the density log and the neutron log, and  
25 the gamma ray is not as conclusive for that particular

1 interval, as far as similarity in character. But in the --  
2 The similarity is again rather obvious between the logs of  
3 the two wells.

4 Q. All right, sir.

5 A. Then moving on up to a section which includes a  
6 carbonate development and a decrease in general porosity  
7 development, as indicated by both the density curve and the  
8 neutron curve, and projecting it across, and come up with a  
9 similar character, as shown on the WM4 log.

10 And this particular method of correlation is  
11 carried out through -- on up the section. And the color  
12 code indicates where we have markers. For instance -- The  
13 color has no particular significance, other than to  
14 identify a change in log character.

15 Q. All right. Let's go to the first area of  
16 difference, this Upper Cherry Canyon base marker, where  
17 Exxon's got it higher than you have.

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Show us how your marker is consistent with the  
20 log curve analysis and to what extent, if any, the Exxon is  
21 inconsistent with that.

22 A. In the interval from the Upper Cherry Canyon  
23 middle to the Upper Cherry Canyon base there are three or  
24 four identifiable character changes that are fairly readily  
25 correlated between the two wells and that the pick that

1 Exxon has made for the WM4, with which I agree, when  
2 attempting to identify the log character in the FV3 well, I  
3 find that the intervals and the key points of correlation  
4 are not consistent.

5 Q. When we go up to the Upper Cherry Canyon Downlap,  
6 let's look at the WM4 well, find that point where it  
7 appears that you and Exxon are in approximate agreement for  
8 the WM4 as to that point. What do you see on that log  
9 curve that puts that marker at that point on the WM4 log?

10 A. The change in character of the gamma ray, along  
11 with the curved character of the caliper. Their pick is  
12 based at the base of a massive carbonate -- I call it  
13 massive carbonate -- interval, which is consistent with  
14 general picks in the area.

15 Q. As we move, then, over to the FV3 well, what  
16 happens to your pick and their pick in relation to the log  
17 curve comparison to the control well, which is the WM4?

18 A. Well, once again, utilizing the character change  
19 or character of the curves and relying predominantly on the  
20 gamma ray, we indicate the carbonate interval that I feel  
21 is more consistent with the picks that were made in the  
22 WM4.

23 Q. Having looked at the method by which Exxon has  
24 placed the net thickness value in the FV3 well, have they  
25 done anything now that you've looked at their data to cause

1 you to change your opinion about your own conclusions?

2 A. No.

3 Q. All right, sir. Let's go to the next display.

4 Again, on the far left side of this cross-  
5 section, Exhibit 3, you've got the FV3 well?

6 A. That's correct.

7 Q. What have you done here?

8 A. The attempt here is to indicate the correlation  
9 between the FV3 and two field wells, the EP -- the Yates  
10 Stonewall EP7, the middle log, and the Stonewall EP6.

11 Q. All right. These are the two Yates wells that  
12 are in that north part of their section that adjoins the  
13 Premier property?

14 A. That's correct.

15 Q. And why did you want to do that?

16 A. I wanted to satisfy myself that what differences  
17 I had encountered were still consistent with what we find  
18 in the northern part of the field, because of the extent of  
19 the Premier acreage in -- the northern part of the Premier  
20 acreage.

21 Q. All right. What's the method here, then? Are  
22 you attempting to take your interpretation of this  
23 reservoir location in the FV3 well and see if your  
24 interpretation fits with what you see in the two Yates  
25 wells up in the north portion?



1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. And if they don't fit, what's -- what are you  
3 going to do?

4 A. Well, I have concluded that the FV3 pick for the  
5 base of the Cherry Canyon is invalid, insofar as Exxon has  
6 picked it in the FV3 well.

7 Q. All right. So this is important to you, then, to  
8 decide which interpretation, either yours or Exxon, makes  
9 sense to you?

10 A. That's correct.

11 Q. All right, sir, show us what you did.

12 A. Essentially the same thing. The tops that I have  
13 picked are shown in black. The tops that Exxon indicates  
14 in their technical report are shown in red.

15 And the essential change is that in the FV3 the  
16 Exxon pick attributes substantially less than what they do  
17 in the EP7 and the EP6, both.

18 Q. All right. When you get over to the EP7, which  
19 is the center log, it appears that you and Exxon are in  
20 pretty good agreement as to where to pick these various  
21 markers?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. Yet when we move over to the west, to the Premier  
24 FV3, their interpretation of the reservoir narrows and  
25 yours doesn't?

1           A.    Considerably, yes.

2           Q.    When you go to the east into the Yates well,  
3   the -- on the far right, it's the Yates EP6 -- you see  
4   additional reservoir in the Yates well that Exxon has not  
5   credited Yates with?

6           A.    In essence, only a minor amount of increase,  
7   which would amount to about 15 feet.

8           Q.    Okay. Having made this comparison, what's your  
9   opinion as a geologist with regards to the correctness of  
10   your conclusions?

11          A.    Based on the previous activity and involvement  
12   with the Cherry Canyon reservoir and other fields in the  
13   area, I've concluded that the interval that was picked by  
14   Exxon is anomalous, as far as the FV3 is concerned, in that  
15   it's not consistent with a fan pattern of development for  
16   the Upper Cherry Canyon in the area of the Avalon field.

17          Q.    We heard from the geologist yesterday that that  
18   was one of his criteria by which he was picking reservoir  
19   values in the Upper Cherry Canyon.

20          A.    In my opinion, it's somewhat inconsistent to say  
21   that there is a -- that extreme a thinning on the flank of  
22   this particular fan development when we're looking at a  
23   series of lenticular deposits during the course of  
24   deposition in the Cherry Canyon interval.

25          Q.    In your opinion, is Exxon's effort to satisfy

1 this regional characterization of the Delaware and the  
2 Upper Cherry Canyon satisfied, then, with their  
3 interpretation?

4 A. I'm not satisfied with their interpretation.  
5 That is why I've concluded that they have not attributed a  
6 sufficient interval to the interval between the Upper  
7 Cherry Canyon middle, top and the base of the Upper Cherry  
8 Canyon.

9 Q. All right. Based upon your conclusions at this  
10 point, then, what did you decide to do?

11 A. Then I decided I had better go ahead and,  
12 utilizing the data that I had concluded, based on the log  
13 evaluation and log comparison, to take that data and  
14 construct an isopach of the thickness of the same interval  
15 that was reported in the technical report, which was the  
16 Upper Cherry Canyon Downlap through -- or to the base of  
17 the Upper Cherry Canyon.

18 Q. And did you do that?

19 A. Yes, I did.

20 Q. And do you have a map that shows that?

21 A. Yes, that's Exhibit Number 4.

22 Q. All right, sir, let's turn to that. You're  
23 welcome to return to your seat there, Jerry. I think the  
24 rest of these displays are pretty small.

25 All right, describe for us how you prepared

1 Exhibit Number 4, the Upper Cherry Canyon isopach.

2 A. Essentially what I did was take the data that I  
3 had concluded from the log evaluation for the FV3 and the  
4 Yates Citadel ZG1 wells and change the gross thickness  
5 figures from what was presented on Exxon's -- in the  
6 technical report of Exxon's as their Map Number 7, which I  
7 have labeled Exhibit Number 4A --

8 Q. All right, so --

9 A. -- and --

10 Q. -- we're going to look at their Map 7 and your  
11 Map 4?

12 A. Yes. Their maps, isopach of the same interval.

13 Q. And your Exhibit 4A is simply a reproduction of  
14 their Map 7?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. All right. Let's look at them side by side now.

17 If you'll start with your map, you've had a  
18 chance to look at the Exxon map, and you have recontoured  
19 the isopach, and are we dealing with a gross or a net  
20 isopach?

21 A. This is a gross thickness of the interval from  
22 the Upper Cherry Canyon Downlap to the base of the Upper  
23 Cherry Canyon.

24 Q. All right. Describe for us the method you've  
25 utilized to recontour the map to integrate them into the

1 Premier tracts, what you believe to be an acknowledgement  
2 of the correct thickness as identified for the FV3 well.

3 A. Essentially what I have done is just recontoured  
4 the area primarily surrounding the FV3, but also to the  
5 north, and feel that it is a more consistent presentation  
6 of the depositional environment in which this interval has  
7 occurred, and where we have a series of sand-lens  
8 developments that are deposited subsequently, indicating to  
9 me that there is a general trend of thickness that would be  
10 more consistent with a fan-type development, or fan-type  
11 accumulation, than what is presented on the Exxon technical  
12 report map, Number 7.

13 Q. Were you able to take the adjustments in values,  
14 then, for the FV3 well? It appears that there's an  
15 adjustment in the FV1 --

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. -- contour those in on a gross thickness map, and  
18 be consistent with and honor the other data?

19 A. Yes, the only data that was changed, actually,  
20 was the data for the FV3 and the Yates Citadel ZG1.

21 Q. Is your interpretation, in your opinion,  
22 consistent with how you would expect to see a Delaware  
23 reservoir distributed?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Once you had made the gross map, then, and you

1 are satisfied that it is accurate, what then did you do?

2 A. The next step that -- Well, actually if I may go  
3 back to the initial stages of preparing this isopach map, I  
4 made a determination that two of the wells that are  
5 presented on the Exxon technical report are incorrectly  
6 located on their map.

7 In support of that, I went to the Oil  
8 Conservation Division office in Artesia and have obtained  
9 the C-101s, the Application for Permit to Drill, to  
10 determine the accurate location of those wells, which are  
11 the wells located in the -- correctly located in the  
12 southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of Section 19.

13 Q. Exhibit 5, then, represents the Division reported  
14 forms as to the location of the Yates SP State 1 and 2  
15 wells?

16 A. EP.

17 Q. I'm sorry, the EP 1 and 2.

18 A. That's correct.

19 Q. What difference does that make?

20 A. Well, it necessarily affects every map that was  
21 prepared in the technical report by changing the location  
22 of the contours.

23 Q. And so what does that mean?

24 A. That means that their map is incorrect, their --  
25 All of their maps with contours are incorrect.

1 Q. Did you incorporate the correct well location,  
2 then, in your map, when you did your contouring for the  
3 gross isopach, Exhibit 4?

4 A. Yes, I did.

5 Q. Having made those adjustments, then, what then  
6 did you do?

7 A. That has led me to contour the thickness map in  
8 the manner in which it's presented in Exhibit 4.

9 Q. All right. Then as part of your methodology as a  
10 geologist, do you attempt to take the gross thickness and  
11 reduce it to a net value?

12 A. Yes, we do, as far as attempting to determine a  
13 net reservoir.

14 Q. All right. Then you can take that information  
15 and prepare a hydrocarbon pore volume map, can you not?

16 A. That was the step -- next step that I took in  
17 order -- because there's a change in what I had determined  
18 as a potential net pay for the FV3 and the Citadel ZG1, and  
19 in so doing, calculated the hydrocarbon porosity thickness  
20 for both of those wells and then subsequently prepared the  
21 hydrocarbon porosity thickness map, as identified as  
22 Exhibit 6.

23 Q. All right, let's turn to Exhibit 6, then.

24 When we look at your Exhibit 6, that can be  
25 compared to the Exxon Map 20, where they're mapping a

1 hydrocarbon pore volume distribution on this Upper Cherry  
2 Canyon reservoir?

3 A. That's correct.

4 Q. Do you have a copy of their map?

5 A. Yes, I do. You don't?

6 Q. I have it out of the book. You've got one?

7 A. Yes, sir.

8 Q. All right, sir. Show us what happens, then, in  
9 your interpretation of the distribution of the hydrocarbon  
10 pore volume map insofar as it affects the area in and  
11 around the Premier tracts.

12 A. Essentially, we -- Based on the calculations  
13 using the identical parameters that were used by Exxon in  
14 preparation of their map, applying that to and then  
15 subsequently recontouring based on these values that I  
16 placed on these two wells, the FV3 and the Citadel ZG1, I  
17 have concluded that -- and contoured the map as presented,  
18 which, in my opinion, is more consistent again with what  
19 you would anticipate in a fan-type development in the  
20 Delaware Mountain Group, particularly in this instance, the  
21 Upper Cherry Canyon.

22 Q. As a result of your correction of the thickness  
23 values for the FV3 well and the FV1, are there now  
24 hydrocarbon pore volume values that should be credited to  
25 the Premier tract that's identified as Unit Tract 6?



1 A. That's correct.

2 Q. And from that interpretation, then, you can  
3 conclude what about the presence of potential primary oil  
4 production within Tract 6?

5 A. I would say it was substantially greater than  
6 what has been attributed to it in the way of primary oil,  
7 inasmuch as the data presented by the technical -- in the  
8 technical report has taken into consideration only that  
9 hydrocarbon that has been previously produced from the  
10 interval in the Upper Cherry Canyon.

11 Q. In addition to changing the values on original  
12 oil in place for Tract 6, would it change any of the values  
13 with regards to any workover potential for that tract?

14 A. Substantially.

15 Q. The Exxon proposal provides no value to this  
16 tract for either of those items, does it?

17 A. No, it does not.

18 Q. In addition, would it also change the value under  
19 the calculation by Exxon of what the potential is for a CO<sub>2</sub>  
20 tertiary oil share?

21 A. Yes, it would.

22 Q. And if your geologic conclusions were integrated  
23 through the Exxon computer, you could make the appropriate  
24 changes to give relative value to Tract 6 under your  
25 geologic conclusions?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. Summarize for us your opinions, Mr. Harrington.

3 A. Essentially, my conclusion is that the values  
4 attributed to the Premier acreage in the technical report  
5 are substantially less than what I have determined to be  
6 the values for the hydrocarbon potential of the Premier Oil  
7 and Gas Inc., acreage.

8 Q. In your opinion, would it be fair and appropriate  
9 for the Division to adopt a statutory unitization concept  
10 based upon the Exxon geologic interpretation?

11 A. No.

12 MR. KELLAHIN: That concludes my examination of  
13 Mr. Harrington.

14 We move the introduction of his Exhibits 1  
15 through 6.

16 EXAMINER STOGNER: Are there any objections?

17 Exhibits 1 through 6 will be admitted into  
18 evidence at this time.

19 Mr. Bruce, your witness.

20 CROSS-EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. BRUCE:

22 Q. Mr. Harrington, when were you first employed by  
23 Premier to examine the Avalon-Delaware geology?

24 A. It was about the middle of March.

25 Q. 1995?

1           A.    Yes, that's correct.

2           Q.    And apparently you concentrated on the Upper  
3 Cherry Canyon geology?

4           A.    That was the concentration.  However, I did make  
5 some additional cross-sections which are not presented into  
6 evidence, but initial studies for the Brushy Canyon also,  
7 and found no particular discrepancies between the  
8 conclusions as presented in the technical report and those  
9 that I came up with.

10          Q.    From the date of your employment, I presume you  
11 didn't attend any meetings of working interest owners at  
12 which geology was discussed?

13          A.    That's a correct presumption.

14          Q.    Now, other than the well logs and the production  
15 info that you mentioned, what other data did you use to  
16 make your exam of the Upper Cherry Canyon?

17          A.    Other data would be the scouting information from  
18 the records that are housed at the Roswell Energy Library,  
19 some subsequent conversations with Mr. Paul White.

20          Q.    And that's it?

21          A.    That's correct.

22          Q.    You didn't examine any cores?

23          A.    No, I did not.

24          Q.    Did you examine the existing Delaware  
25 completions?

1           A.    Only insofar as they were presented in the  
2   scouting reports from the scout tickets of the Roswell  
3   Energy Library.

4           Q.    Did you examine any mud logs?

5           A.    There were none available from the -- to me from  
6   the Roswell Energy Library.

7           Q.    Did you look at the logs from wells in Section  
8   31?

9           A.    Yes, I did. As a matter of fact, another  
10   preliminary -- in the preliminary part of the study,  
11   constructed a cross-section from the Exxon C3 well to the  
12   C1 well, to the WM4, to the FV3.

13          Q.    Now, on your Exhibit 1 and --

14          A.    Do you want me to take the others down?

15          Q.    Yeah, if you could. It might help us all. Thank  
16   you.

17                Now, I think you indicated in the FV3 well on the  
18   Upper Cherry Canyon Downlap, there's a difference between  
19   your pick and Exxon's pick of about 42 feet or roughly 40  
20   feet?

21          A.    Yes, that's correct.

22          Q.    Now, does changing the Upper Cherry Canyon  
23   Downlap surface, changing that alone in the FV3 well,  
24   change the net thickness for that well?

25          A.    In this instance it does change, yes.

1 Q. It does?

2 A. However, in the preparation of the isopach map of  
3 that gross interval from the Upper Cherry Canyon Downlap  
4 through the Cherry Canyon base, I did not include that  
5 difference in thickness.

6 Q. Why not?

7 A. Primarily because it did not appear to affect the  
8 character of the potential Cherry Canyon productive  
9 interval.

10 Q. Is it tight?

11 A. It's a carbonate, low porosity and no indications  
12 of hydrocarbon.

13 Q. Okay. So that wouldn't have any effect on what  
14 is really productive in the Upper Cherry --

15 A. No.

16 Q. -- Canyon interval?

17 Is it common for Delaware formation components  
18 like the Upper Cherry or the Brushy to have significant  
19 thickness variations?

20 A. Yes, laterally.

21 Q. Laterally.

22 Now, in looking at these wells, were any of these  
23 wells, to your knowledge, significantly deviated from the  
24 vertical?

25 A. I did not look to that particular aspect.

1 Q. Okay. From what you've seen, there's no  
2 indication that they were deviated?

3 A. Not to my knowledge, not based on the logs that I  
4 had available to me. And also based on the character of  
5 the caliper, it would indicate that you have a relatively  
6 true hole.

7 Q. Just one final question, Mr. Harrington. If  
8 you'd refer to your Exhibits 6 and 6A --

9 A. Yes, I have them.

10 Q. -- if you look at these two maps, really, the  
11 contour lines you use are -- except when you get in the  
12 area of the FV3 well and the ZG1 well -- are pretty  
13 similar, almost identical to Exxon's contour lines?

14 A. Yes, I used the same data.

15 Q. Okay. So the only difference is over there,  
16 right on Premier's acreage?

17 A. And the Yates acreage to the south, and  
18 somewhat -- Well, yes, that additionally would be the  
19 Premier acreage on the northern part of the 160 acres  
20 that's been included in the unit outline.

21 MR. BRUCE: That's it, Mr. Examiner.

22 EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you, Mr. Bruce.

23 Mr. Carr?

24 MR. CARR: I have no questions.

25 EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Kellahin, any redirect?

1 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, sir.

2 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

3 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

4 Q. Mr. Harrington, if you'll go back to your Exhibit  
5 Number 3, the three-well cross-section, the far right log  
6 is the Yates -- it's the EP6 well, it's the well in the  
7 northeast-northwest of 30?

8 A. We're still on B-B'?

9 Q. No, sir, you're on Exhibit 3. It's the three-  
10 well cross-section.

11 A. Three, I'm sorry.

12 Q. Yeah, you've got it there.

13 A. Yeah.

14 Q. It's the far right. I'm sorry, the far right  
15 log, that is that Yates EP Number 6 well. Do you see that?

16 A. That's correct.

17 Q. All right. On the base map and on the Exxon  
18 presentation, the EP6 well is identified as the 40-acre  
19 Tract 1113. Do you see that?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. All right. When we're looking at the reservoir  
22 in that well, from the Upper Cherry Canyon top down to the  
23 Upper Cherry Canyon base, the Exxon Exhibit Number 10, Part  
24 I, shows a value for that well on Exhibit E-6 -- I'll show  
25 it to you.

1           If you read across on Tract 1113, they're going  
2 to come up with a net thickness value, and I'm going to  
3 show it to you.

4           See what the report shows for net thickness in  
5 that Yates well, the 99.56 feet?

6           A.    Yes.

7           Q.    Do you see that?

8           A.    Yes.

9           Q.    Would you go to the log on that EP6 well and find  
10 me 99 feet of net thickness?

11          A.    I don't believe I can do that.

12          Q.    Why can't you do that?

13          A.    I don't feel that there is that -- based on my  
14 evaluation of the logs, that there isn't that much of a  
15 total net porosity thickness in that interval.

16          Q.    Well, show us how you would count and determine  
17 net porosity thickness on that well.

18          A.    It's somewhat difficult to do it just from the  
19 log itself because of the nature, the character of the  
20 calculations for the porosity determinations. But based on  
21 the evaluation of the curve through that interval in the  
22 EP6, I cannot attribute the 99.56 net feet of net thickness  
23 of porosity.

24          Q.    All right. If you were counting up net thickness  
25 for the log on that well, would a range between 30 and 35



1 feet be more accurate?

2 A. That's somewhat pessimistic, but I would -- If I  
3 recall the figures that I arrived at, it would be in the  
4 vicinity of 40 to 42.

5 Q. Forty to 42, of net porosity thickness that  
6 should have been put in the book for that well?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. As result of crediting that well with 99 feet  
9 instead of 42 feet, what happened?

10 A. That would substantially increase the reserves  
11 attributable to that in the EP6.

12 Q. It looks like a mistake, then?

13 A. It does to me, yes, sir.

14 MR. KELLAHIN: No further questions.

15 EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Kellahin.

16 Mr. Bruce?

17 MR. BRUCE: I have one thing, Mr. Examiner.

18 RECROSS-EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. BRUCE:

20 Q. On the FV3 well, you show this additional -- I  
21 think you said it was about an extra 80 feet?

22 A. Eighty-four feet.

23 Q. Eighty-four feet.

24 A. Gross.

25 Q. At the Upper Cherry Canyon base.

1           Has that interval ever been tested on Premier's  
2 acreage?

3           A.    To my knowledge, it was neither drill stem  
4 tested, nor has it been perforated.

5           Q.    Do you know why not?

6           A.    No, I certainly don't.

7           MR. BRUCE: Thank you, Mr. Harrington.

8           EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Kellahin, a point of  
9 reference.

10          MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, sir.

11          EXAMINER STOGNER: When you were referring back  
12 in the booklet to 99 feet, I couldn't find that.

13               Which page was that? I thought you said E-6.

14          MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, sir, it's in Exhibit E-6,  
15 behind the E section, E-6, and then it's this one right  
16 here.

17               (Off the record)

18          EXAMINER STOGNER: I have no questions of this  
19 witness at this time, myself.

20               You may continue.

21          MR. KELLAHIN: At this time we call Mr. Paul  
22 White.

23          EXAMINER STOGNER: Are we going to be using these  
24 cross-sections?

25          MR. KELLAHIN: No, 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

PAUL G. WHITE,

the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon  
his oath, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KELLAHIN:

Q. Paul, are you all set?

A. Yes.

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

A. My name is Paul G. White. I live in Artesia, New  
Mexico, and I'm presently the owner of Blanco Engineering,  
Incorporated.

Q. You also hold a professional engineering degree,  
do you not, sir?

A. Yes, sir, I do.

Q. On prior occasions have you qualified and  
testified before this agency as an expert in matters of  
petroleum engineering?

A. Yes, sir, and the Texas Railroad Commission,  
Kansas Corporation Commission and Oklahoma Corporation  
Commission.

Q. Do you now act as a consultant for operators,  
including Ken Jones as the operator of Premier Oil and Gas,  
Inc.?

A. Yes, sir, I do.

1 Q. And with his assistance and on his behalf, did  
2 you look at and review the Exxon technical report, which is  
3 identified as Exhibit 10, introduced yesterday in the  
4 hearing?

5 A. Yes, sir, I have.

6 Q. And have you attended some of the meetings and  
7 discussions with Exxon personnel concerning the Premier  
8 interest in this property in the unit?

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. In addition, have you conducted your own  
11 investigation with regards to the issue of the log  
12 correlation, insofar as the interpretation between Exxon  
13 and Premier is concerned, for the FV3 well?

14 A. Yes, I have.

15 Q. And based upon all that work, do you now have  
16 certain opinions and conclusions as an expert?

17 A. Yes, I do.

18 MR. KELLAHIN: We tender Mr. White as an expert  
19 petroleum engineer.

20 EXAMINER STOGNER: Are there any objections?  
21 There being none, Mr. White is so qualified.

22 Q. (By Mr. Kellahin) Mr. White, let's turn to the  
23 first topic. It's Exhibit Number 7 for Premier. It's a  
24 two-well cross-section. I think it's labeled B-B'. Do you  
25 have that in front of you, sir?

1           A.    Yes, sir, I do.

2           Q.    Summarize for us your understanding of the  
3           dispute between Exxon and Premier insofar as it affects  
4           this well.

5           A.    If I might precede my remarks or my testimony a  
6           bit, I originally was retained by Mr. Jones, owner of  
7           Premier Oil and Gas, to take a look at the Exxon technical  
8           report, and I went to a meeting in March of 1993 -- I  
9           believe it was in March -- and we met with Exxon personnel  
10          and discussed some of the issues in the proposed unit.

11                  The -- In the meeting, I came out of the meeting,  
12          although there was not a popular -- I mean a formal vote  
13          taken, in all probability I told Premier, Mr. Jones, that  
14          he would be left out of the unit.

15                  Subsequent to that --

16          Q.    Well, how did you reach that conclusion?

17          A.    The discussion at the end of the meeting was one  
18          of that, generally, the atmosphere generally was that Exxon  
19          and the other operators would not mind if Premier stayed  
20          out.

21          Q.    This is in April of 1994, I think, if you look --

22          A.    Yes, sir, I believe that's right.

23          Q.    All right. During that sequence, then, in April  
24          of 1994, you were going to these meetings, and you came  
25          away with the conclusion that Premier was to be excluded?

1           A.    Yes, sir, that's correct.

2           Q.    Upon what basis?

3           A.    Just on the general atmosphere in the meeting.  
4   The -- I had already decided from the technical report that  
5   Premier's equity, that Premier's position, they -- The  
6   Exxon report had given Premier some equity, only in the CO<sub>2</sub>  
7   tertiary part of this unit, and I had studied the report  
8   enough to tell that that was a -- The CO<sub>2</sub> portion of it was  
9   a completely clinical report, it was clinical, it was not  
10   something which was based on everyday theoretical  
11   operation, operation that's going to take place, period.

12                So I -- From this discussion in the meeting, I  
13   did in fact inform Mr. Jones that I felt like the outcome  
14   would be that Premier would be left out of the unit.

15           Q.    All right, sir. That did not occur?

16           A.    No, sir, it did not.

17                And after that did not happen, Mr. Jones  
18   contacted me and asked me to see what I thought about the  
19   equities, about the log correlations, and just generally  
20   give him an idea as to how I felt, since I had been in on a  
21   lot of unitizations and parameters and equities and all of  
22   the rest of the stuff, to give him an idea of what I felt  
23   about the report, as to accuracy.

24           Q.    What did you tell him?

25           A.    I told him that I would take a look at the --

1 mainly the log correlation, because I had already spotted  
2 some things in the report that concerned me as to the  
3 correlation of the Exxon/Yates wells over to the Premier  
4 wells, especially the Upper Cherry Canyon.

5           What I did to corroborate this, independent of  
6 any instructions from anyone, I took the WM4, the offset  
7 well to the Premier FV3, and at the risk of over-  
8 simplification I disregarded the tops and bases of the  
9 Cherry Canyon and picked out, I believe there's five --  
10 yes, five -- very obvious correlative points that I could  
11 tie in and correlate the WM4 well with the FV3 well.

12           Q.   You're doing this based upon your own experience  
13 and knowledge?

14           A.   Yes, sir, that's right, independent of anything  
15 -- of anything else. Independent of even the reservoir  
16 that we're studying, independent of that.

17           But I took the logs and correlated them in the  
18 vicinity of the Upper Cherry Canyon, and from my  
19 correlation I concluded that there were five major  
20 characteristics on the log profile, on the gamma ray, that  
21 we could specifically identify and accurately correlate.  
22 And like I said, maybe oversimplification, but I believe it  
23 basically ties everything together.

24           Q.   What two wells are on the B-B' cross-section,  
25 Exhibit 7?

1           A.    The Premier FV3 well and the Yates Petroleum  
2 Corporation well, the WM4, which is an east offset to the  
3 FV3.

4           Q.    How does your conclusion about the correlation  
5 compare to Mr. Harrington's work?

6           A.    After I correlated these major five points -- and  
7 I can give you those if you would like. Those major five  
8 characteristics mainly were shale breaks on the gamma ray,  
9 the lithology.

10                  And after I did this correlation, I then could  
11 see that it corroborated Mr. Harrington's work, especially  
12 on the base of the Upper Cherry Canyon.

13           Q.    Did you do anything else with your cross-section  
14 to further verify your opinion about the conclusion of the  
15 correlation?

16           A.    No, sir, I did not. After I did the five points  
17 I did do this: I called in two log experts from different  
18 companies and did not tell them anything, that this was a  
19 unit, that this had a technical report involved or  
20 anything. I just gave them the logs and I said, You boys  
21 get a cup of coffee and sit over there on that couch and  
22 correlate these logs for me.

23                  MR. BRUCE: Mr. Examiner, I think I'm going to  
24 object even before he gets to the answer. He's testifying  
25 about what another expert is saying. That's a classic



1 hearsay. It's not admissible.

2 EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Kellahin?

3 MR. KELLAHIN: Rule 701 of the Rules of Evidence  
4 for the State of New Mexico allow an expert such as Mr.  
5 White to incorporate the testimony, conclusions and work  
6 product of other experts.

7 It's permitted here. We've been doing it for two  
8 days now. It's certainly appropriate for him to talk about  
9 what other experts have done in terms of log correlation.  
10 It's a well-established exception to the hearsay. It's  
11 permitted by expert witnesses.

12 (Off the record)

13 EXAMINER STOGNER: I would agree with Mr. Bruce  
14 in this case, Mr. Kellahin. The other experts are not  
15 here, so I would like to keep it to the exhibit at hand,  
16 Exhibit Number 7. So if we can identify on that, with your  
17 expertise, Mr. White -- Mr. Kellahin, if you'll key the  
18 question towards that.

19 Q. (By Mr. Kellahin) Based upon the results of the  
20 log correlation in your work, did you present your work to  
21 Mr. Harrington?

22 A. Yes, after I finished my correlation with these  
23 five major points of lithology that I could tie together,  
24 and I felt like it uncomplicated the situation, I presented  
25 these to Mr. Harrington, and my correlation was identical

1 to Mr. Harrington's.

2 Q. All right. There was nothing in his work product  
3 that you examined that caused you to change your own  
4 conclusions about this issue?

5 A. No, sir, there was not.

6 Q. In looking at the technical report, the Exxon  
7 Exhibit 10, there's lots of information in it, and I don't  
8 propose to cover all these issues with you, Mr. White.

9 But I would like to ask you whether or not you  
10 had an opportunity to examine how the study report handles  
11 the concept of the waterflood target oil. Let's take that  
12 for a moment. Identify what we're talking about, and then  
13 see how that fits into the system.

14 A. The technical report handles the waterflood  
15 target oil by wells, tracts, and I don't have that exhibit  
16 in front of me but the target oil is listed -- waterflood  
17 target oil is listed for each tract in each well in the  
18 unit perimeter.

19 Q. Mr. White, we talked about the Exhibit E-6 a  
20 while ago with Mr. Harrington. I'm going to show you the  
21 exhibit book from Exxon, and I've turned to the exhibit  
22 that says Exhibit E-6.

23 If you go through that spreadsheet in E-6,  
24 there's going to be a value assigned to each of these  
25 tracts for a waterflood target oil potential, is there not?

1 I forgot the vocabulary, but there is a volume of  
2 recoverable oil --

3 A. Yes, sir.

4 Q. -- that's attributed to that incremental portion  
5 of total recovery that's going to be responding to  
6 waterflooding?

7 A. Yes, sir, and as that is tabulated, it is  
8 separate from CO<sub>2</sub> and primary.

9 Q. All right. When you look at the unit agreement  
10 and the subsequent conclusions, you get to the Premier  
11 tracts, and they receive no value for the incremental oil  
12 attributed to waterflood, do they?

13 A. No, sir, they receive no value. If we could move  
14 to Exhibit 8, I could spot some waterflood target oil on  
15 Exhibit 8.

16 Q. All right, sir. What I'm looking for is, you  
17 have taken -- You've taken Exhibit E-6 --

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. -- taken that information out of that  
20 spreadsheet, and you have put it on Exhibit Number 8?

21 A. Yes, sir, the Exhibit 8 when it comes into play  
22 here has numbers on it taken from the technical report.

23 Q. Let's look at Exhibit 8.

24 A. Exhibit 8?

25 Q. What have you done?

1           A.    There again, it's a possibly simplification, but  
2    I took the waterflood target oil as attributed to the  
3    different wells and tracts by the Exxon technical report  
4    and spotted those on the base map, the Avalon-Delaware  
5    field base map, and this concerned me.

6           I looked at it from a standpoint of Premier's  
7    equity at the same time I was looking at this, and when I  
8    saw the target oil for waterflood reserves as exhibited on  
9    the Exhibit 8, in the Premier acreage over there on the  
10   west side, starting at the top, 480, 630 -- 63 -- these are  
11   thousands of barrels -- and I looked at those target  
12   numbers and then I could not find any equity for waterflood  
13   reserves given to Premier.

14          Q.    Now, you're only working with their technical  
15   report, and this doesn't include anything that Harrington  
16   has done in terms of the geologic interpretation he's got?

17          A.    No, sir, it does not.

18          Q.    You're working strictly with their geologic  
19   assumptions and their technical report?

20          A.    Yes, sir, from the Exxon report.

21                So I told Premier, I said, It looks like that  
22   Yates and Exxon want to use your tract for injection  
23   purposes and to recover reserves between the Premier tract  
24   and their tracts, without giving you any equity at all, and  
25   you can't have both.

1           You either have to have some equity or you have  
2 to be left out of the unit. Exxon and Yates can't have  
3 both pieces of pie by giving you waterflood target oil and  
4 then denying equity in the waterflood reserve.

5           Q. Well, start in the southeast corner of the unit,  
6 and when you take the values out of their spreadsheet and  
7 put it down as this waterflood target oil per tract, what  
8 does this show you?

9           A. Well, it shows me that in the southeast portion  
10 there's some waterflood target oil that probably is not  
11 even economically recoverable in the waterflood. And yet  
12 those particular tracts in that area received equity.

13          Q. So what happens when you move over to the Premier  
14 tracts on the northwest side of the unit?

15          A. Well, there again, I see a couple million barrels  
16 of -- approximately -- of waterflood target oil, which  
17 would be in the secondary phase of the operation. And when  
18 I see that many barrels in the report that Exxon prepared  
19 and then I look at the equity that Exxon -- that Premier  
20 received, which was all attributable to CO<sub>2</sub>, nothing to  
21 waterflood, nothing to secondary, I can't take that  
22 together, I can't --

23          Q. When you look at the spreadsheet can you figure  
24 out how it suddenly disappeared from the equity?

25          A. No, sir, I cannot tell you that, and I have --

1 from the -- You see, from the geological interpretations  
2 that we've done earlier, that Mr. Harrington has done, that  
3 I've done, when we take the geological interpretations, we  
4 see the gross interval change in our opinion, and that's  
5 our conclusion, it should change, we think we're accurate.

6 Now, then, that just goes down further and  
7 changes net. When you change net, then you have an  
8 inaccuracy or misconception in the calculation of equity.  
9 So it all runs down into that point.

10 And then when we see the waterflood target oil as  
11 posted by Exxon in Exhibit E-6 -- yeah -- then I can't come  
12 up with why the Premier tract is not credited with the  
13 proper equity.

14 Q. Let's turn to another topic. Did you examine the  
15 issue of how the oil attributed to workover -- We had Dr.  
16 Boneau yesterday tell us the workover potential value was  
17 credited to the waterflood incremental oil.

18 A. Yes, sir.

19 Q. When you look at G-19 in the exhibit, Exxon  
20 Exhibit 10 -- there's the spreadsheet there -- the workover  
21 target oil is factored into the participation values for  
22 the waterflood?

23 A. Yes, it is involved in the parameter -- that is,  
24 one of the three parameters that is figured into the  
25 equity.

1           Q.    As a reservoir engineer, when you look at the  
2   offsetting Yates tracts to the west and look at the Premier  
3   tracts, does this make sense to you in terms of workover  
4   potential and how this credit is applied?

5           A.    Most of the reservoirs I've worked with, and  
6   worked with unit -- on subcommittees, generally  
7   subcommittees and so on, when we establish parameters --  
8   most of them have never included, to my knowledge, workover  
9   reserves.

10                Because if you see in the Exhibit G-19 266,000  
11   barrels of workover reserves, if I was the administration  
12   and that hadn't been developed, explored, I think I'd get  
13   rid of somebody, because this 266,000 barrels of workover  
14   oil setting in a well out there, and knowing that  
15   unitization is going to take place, I think I would have  
16   been working it over. Of course, they did. Now, I think  
17   Mr. Boneau testified that it's nowhere near going to reach  
18   that value of 266,000 barrels.

19                Then he testified that they don't want to change  
20   the report. Well, how come you have 266,000 barrels  
21   attributed from workover oil? The engineer for Yates  
22   Petroleum testifies that this isn't going to do this, but  
23   he doesn't want to revamp the report. Well, how can you do  
24   that? I guess I'm asking the question, but I'm leaving it  
25   open.

1           Q.    What were your ultimate conclusions to -- and  
2    recommendations to Mr. Jones with regards to the unit?

3           A.    This is what I recommended. I told Mr. Jones  
4    that with the technical report as it stands and the equity  
5    only in CO<sub>2</sub> reserves -- which is to me honestly quite  
6    clinical at this time, there's nothing that says that's  
7    going to even happen -- and with that being his  
8    contribution to this unit, I would request the Examiner,  
9    respectfully request, that I be allowed to remain out of  
10   the unit completely, or, secondly, that we have some kind  
11   of re-evaluation by Exxon that has the facilities to do  
12   this -- I know they do -- to re-examine this and re-  
13   establish equities, which takes into consideration the fact  
14   that there's less workover target oil on some of the  
15   Exxon/Yates tracts, there's some on the Premier tract, and  
16   certainly there's some waterflood secondary oil to be  
17   recovered on the Premier tract.

18               Now, those two things is what I recommended to  
19   Mr. Jones.

20           Q.    In your opinion, should the Division approve the  
21   statutory unitization as proposed by Exxon?

22           A.    Pardon me?

23           Q.    In your opinion, should the Division approve the  
24   statutory unitization as proposed by Exxon?

25           A.    No. Statutory unitization -- as Mr. Stogner



1 knows, better than I do -- it has a purpose and a good one,  
2 it has a definite purpose. It saves a lot of people from  
3 riding the wagon, so to speak, without putting up the  
4 money. It's saved a lot of reserves, it's saved waste,  
5 it's protected correlative rights in many cases.

6 But the tailgate on statutory pooling is still  
7 the -- It has to be equitable for all the people involved  
8 inside of the perimeter of the unit.

9 I think that if Exxon owned Premier's tracts, or  
10 Yates, and saw those target oil -- waterflood target  
11 figures, I think they would not want to be credited with  
12 one percent, and I think they probably would move over  
13 further west, if it were their tract, and include more  
14 acreage.

15 Q. At this point, does Tract 6 the Premier tract,  
16 receive relative value for its potential contribution to  
17 the unit in terms of remaining primary potential,  
18 waterflood potential and CO<sub>2</sub> potential?

19 A. No, no, no.

20 MR. KELLAHIN: That concludes my examination of  
21 Mr. White.

22 We move the introduction of his Exhibits 7 and 8.

23 EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibit 7 and 8 will be  
24 admitted into evidence.

25 Mr. Bruce, your witness.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BRUCE:

Q. Your Exhibit 7, Mr. White, when did you prepare that correlation?

A. I prepared this correlation -- It was after the June meeting in Midland with Exxon. That meeting, I know. It was sometime --

Q. June, 1994?

A. Yes, uh-huh. Yes.

Q. So you prepared that well in advance of anything that Mr. Harrington did?

A. Yes, sir, I had this prepared probably -- I'm going to say I had this prepared along in January, February of 1995.

Q. Have you ever made a calculation of how much primary reserves remain on Tract 6, the 160-acre Premier tract?

A. No, sir, I have not.

Q. You haven't. Have you calculated waterflood reserves on that?

A. No, sir.

Q. Did you ever inform Mr. Jones that the only way to really prove up his acreage was to develop it by drilling a well or recompleting a well?

A. Yes, sir.

1 Q. When?

2 A. I have put it this way, that it would be nice if  
3 this had been the -- you know, if the primary production  
4 had been developed. Mr. Jones has some real, concrete and  
5 very, very serious comments to make about that, though.

6 There's a situation that exists that's different  
7 from Exxon or Yates on development, and I did inform Mr.  
8 Jones that it would have been better -- I'll put it that  
9 way -- had we developed the primary reserves on this tract.

10 Q. Okay, but when did you recommend this to him?

11 A. Probably two or three different times, driving  
12 down the road. Who knows? I don't know what day.

13 Q. 1993?

14 A. I -- Yeah, yeah, probably sometime in 1993. I  
15 wouldn't -- I don't have any idea.

16 Q. So you -- Since you've never calculated reserves,  
17 you've never done pay-out calculations for a well on Tract  
18 6 either?

19 A. No, sir, I haven't.

20 Q. Do you know the current status of the FV3 well?

21 A. Yes, sir.

22 Q. What is it?

23 A. It's temporarily abandoned.

24 Q. When was the date of last production?

25 A. I don't know. I don't know the answer to that

1 one.

2 Q. Okay. Now, if workover reserves do exist on the  
3 Premier tract, why haven't they made some attempt to go  
4 after that?

5 A. Well, there again, I think that that will be  
6 explained better by another witness. I don't know.

7 Q. Now, on your Exhibit 8, the waterflood target oil  
8 -- Now, you have examined the technical report, right?

9 A. Yes, sir.

10 Q. Are you aware that the waterflood target oil does  
11 not include history matching?

12 A. Does not include what?

13 Q. History matching.

14 A. No.

15 Q. You're not aware of that?

16 A. No.

17 Q. So you're not aware that these figures were  
18 calibrated with actual production?

19 A. No, sir.

20 Q. Another thing on this map, of course, there's no  
21 planned waterflood injectors over on the Premier tract  
22 either, is there?

23 A. I don't know.

24 MR. BRUCE: Just a minute, Mr. Examiner.

25 Nothing further.

1 EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Bruce.

2 Mr. Carr?

3 EXAMINATION

4 BY MR. CARR:

5 Q. Mr. White, just a brief question.

6 I understood your testimony to be that you in  
7 your experience considered it inappropriate to include in  
8 one of these equity formulas reserves that had not been  
9 developed; was that your testimony?

10 A. Would you repeat that, Mr. Carr?

11 Q. I understood you to say that you, in your  
12 experience, felt it was inappropriate to include in one of  
13 these equity calculations or formulas reserves that had not  
14 been developed; was that your testimony?

15 A. Yes, that's right, workover reserves. I just  
16 made this statement that I had not run into that kind of  
17 situation.

18 Q. And what you're here asking today is that credits  
19 be given to the Premier tract for reserves that they have  
20 never even tested?

21 A. Yes, that's right.

22 MR. CARR: Thank you.

23 EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you, Mr. Carr.

24 Mr. Kellahin, any more redirect?

25 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, sir.

## REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. KELLAHIN:

Q. There's a difference, is there not, Mr. White, between workover reserves and remaining primary recoverable oil to be credited to a tract?

A. Well, they could be lumped together, they could be separated. It would depend on the situation and the reservoir. It would depend on what had been developed and what hadn't been developed.

Q. So when we talk about how Exxon has approached this in terms of methodology, the workover potential has been added into the waterflood component of oil recovery?

A. Yes, sir.

Q. And that remaining primary oil is going to be identified in a different way?

A. Yes, sir.

MR. KELLAHIN: No further questions.

EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you, Mr. Kellahin.

Mr. Bruce, anything further for this witness?

MR. BRUCE: No, sir.

EXAMINER STOGNER: Does anybody else have anything further for Mr. White?

You may be excused at this time.

Let's take a 20-minute recess.

(Thereupon, a recess was taken at 9:55 a.m.)

1 (The following proceedings had at 10:17 a.m.)

2 EXAMINER STOGNER: Hearing will come to order.

3 Mr. Kellahin?

4 MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you, Mr. Examiner. Call at  
5 this time Mr. Ken Jones.

6 KENNETH C. JONES,

7 the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon  
8 his oath, was examined and testified as follows:

9 DIRECT EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

11 Q. Mr. Jones, would you please state your name and  
12 where you reside?

13 A. Kenneth C. Jones, in Dallas, Texas.

14 Q. Mr. Jones, what is your involvement with the  
15 company known as Premier Oil and Gas, Inc.?

16 A. I'm the owner and probably what you would term as  
17 head of operations, since it's kind of a mom-and-pop  
18 operation.

19 Q. That was a company that your dad and mom had when  
20 your dad was alive?

21 A. In association with me.

22 Q. Okay. What's your educational background?

23 A. I have a chemistry degree from Baylor University  
24 and also a Doctor of Dental Surgery degree from Baylor  
25 College of Dentistry in Dallas.

1 Q. In addition to handling your family's oil and gas  
2 operations under Premier, you're a practicing dentist?

3 A. Correct.

4 Q. How did you go about analyzing and reviewing what  
5 we've been talking about for a day and a half, the Exxon  
6 technical report, this August of 1992 report? Did you read  
7 it?

8 A. A number of times.

9 Q. As a practical oil and gas operator, what is your  
10 background and ability to understand for your own  
11 information a report like this?

12 A. I've been around the oil and gas business since  
13 probably I was a junior or senior in high school, when Dad  
14 would have logs spread across the table and he'd read the  
15 investigating stuff, so it's been a kind of a hands-on type  
16 of operation. I haven't really had any formal education;  
17 I've read books in the oil and gas -- Schlumberger, log  
18 books, those kinds of things -- and taught myself.

19 Q. What kind of operation did your dad have under  
20 Premier? What was he doing?

21 A. It's a small oil and gas company. We operated a  
22 waterflood and various little wells around the area, in  
23 Eddy County and -- I think we have one well in Lea County.

24 Q. When you got the technical report, you spent time  
25 reviewing it and reading it?



1           A.    Correct, a lot.

2           Q.    Describe for us the kinds of things that you saw  
3   in the report and what kind of reaction you had to those  
4   items that were important to you.

5           A.    Well, initially I was a little flabbergasted at  
6   the amount of reserves in the report. I had no idea that  
7   CO<sub>2</sub> could do quite what it was going to do, and I was -- I  
8   was excited about what the report was going to lead to.

9                   I spent many hours looking at logs, correlating  
10  logs out in the area, justifying their picks, following  
11  their methodology in terms of oil in place, looking at  
12  their economics, evaluating their economics in trying to  
13  get a sense of, is this really feasible? That's pretty  
14  much it.

15          Q.    As you studied the report, trying to see how it  
16  was put together to make sense of the methodology and the  
17  analysis, did you come across, in your review, any items  
18  that simply were mistakes?

19          A.    Yes I did.

20          Q.    I don't want to spend the rest of the morning  
21  looking at those issues, but can you give us an  
22  illustration of the kinds of things that you found that  
23  have caused you concern?

24          A.    Well, there was a problem in the Brushy Canyon on  
25  the FV1.

1 Q. Let's use that as an example, just to illustrate  
2 it.

3 A. Okay.

4 Q. When you go to the Brushy Canyon on the FV1,  
5 somewhere in this book -- I think it's in the log picks --  
6 there's a section that will pick a log and you'll get a  
7 value for the Brushy Canyon, right?

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. All right. Where would we find that in the book?

10 A. That's in Appendix C-1. It's about the -- Let's  
11 see. The third page. The FV1 is listed up at the back of  
12 the third page, at the top.

13 Q. You're in Exhibit C-1?

14 A. Correct.

15 Q. The book is organized so you have --

16 A. Well, it's in the appendix section, Appendix C-1.  
17 It says "Tops File" on it. And the third page, on the back  
18 of the third page, lists the correlative points for the  
19 FV1.

20 Q. All right, give us the example. What did they  
21 have?

22 A. We've got a small problem here in that they've  
23 got an LC and an LC pick, 3597 and 3627, and if you can for  
24 instance just look down at the CE well, that should be an  
25 LC and an LM pick. So what they list as 3627 should really

1 be LM.

2 Q. All right.

3 A. The significance of that is that when you go back  
4 to their cross-sectional maps and you go to cross-sectional  
5 number 2 --

6 Q. Let's do that, let's take the map book, turn to  
7 cross-sectional 2. The FV1 is the first well on the left?

8 A. Correct.

9 Q. All right.

10 A. And the computer goes in and it draws the LCH top  
11 at the LM level, and it actually picks up this 3627 as the  
12 top, and it's very easily seen that, as listed in the  
13 report, the LC top is at 3597. So there's a difference of  
14 30 feet there.

15 Q. And the FV1, then, comes up short by 32 feet?

16 A. Correct, when you subtract what their LM value is  
17 down to the base of the Brushy Canyon, that's 185 feet.  
18 And if you take that value and go to Map 4 --

19 Q. All right, let's see how it got transformed,  
20 then, when we go to Map 4.

21 A. You'll see that they have listed the FV1 as 185  
22 gross feet.

23 Q. And what should that value be?

24 A. 215 feet.

25 Q. The log value, then, from part of the report says

1 215?

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. And yet when it gets transposed to Map 4, it now  
4 only has 185 feet?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. As you place the 200-foot contour, then, the 200-  
7 foot contour is east of that well, and in fact it should be  
8 west of the well?

9 A. Correct. And all these contours are computer-  
10 generated, so all the contours are going to change from  
11 that point.

12 Now, to substantiate that this is actually an  
13 error in their volumetrics, if you go to E-6, Exhibit E-6,  
14 and it's the fourth page from the back of E-6, the FV1 is  
15 actually -- the location, 1309. It will be the fourth well  
16 listed down at the top.

17 Q. Okay, what does that show you?

18 A. That shows me that on this location they're going  
19 to drill a producer when it gets to -- CO<sub>2</sub> of whenever --  
20 another 330 feet closer to the east section line, or it  
21 will be 660 off of the east section line between Yates and  
22 us. They have listed that that location is going to have  
23 212 gross feet of interval.

24 Now, when you follow the trend, the FV1, instead  
25 of being listed at 185, should be listed at 215. And if

1 you follow the computer generation and look over to the  
2 EP5, which they have correct, it's 283 feet.

3 All of those contour lines are incorrect, and  
4 they need to be redone. And this will substantially change  
5 oil in place also.

6 Q. In addition to your own review of the book, did  
7 you hire consultants to aid you in the process?

8 A. Yes, I did.

9 Q. What conclusions have you come to on behalf of  
10 your company?

11 A. The conclusions I have come to is, we have run  
12 into a problem in terms of how this equity is being driven,  
13 and the conclusions are based upon the extra credit on the  
14 E-6, the EP6.

15 This miscalculation, lack of waterflood reserves,  
16 there's a question of lack of primary reserves -- And  
17 because of this formula which was generated between Yates  
18 and Exxon and which was not any way driven by us, we feel  
19 like we're in an unequitable position.

20 Q. When Exxon was first proposing the formation of  
21 the working interest unit back in 1991, were you, your mom  
22 or dad included or invited to be included in that process?

23 A. Well, apparently they had a May meeting in 1991,  
24 which we had no notification for, which was, I guess, a  
25 subcommittee meeting or something to allow Exxon to

1 generate this technical report.

2 Q. Mr. Boneau referred yesterday to an OCD GOR case  
3 in which he made a presentation for Yates, asking for an  
4 increase in the gas-oil ratio.

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. And your dad was alive at that time and appeared  
7 and made statements to the Division with regards to what  
8 his intentions were for his property?

9 A. Correct.

10 Q. Are you familiar with that?

11 A. Yes, I am.

12 Q. Why don't you give us your point of view in the  
13 chronology with regards to what has happened to yours and  
14 your family's interest in this tract?

15 A. This whole situation with nondevelopment is not  
16 in any way Premier's fault, not in any way Yates' fault,  
17 not in any way Exxon's fault; it is a matter of  
18 circumstances which were generated out of history. There's  
19 not any fault that belies anybody at this point.

20 The lease, the FV lease, was purchased in July of  
21 1990, and it was purchased with in mind the Bone Springs  
22 formation and the Delaware formation. Those were our two  
23 major targets when we purchased the lease from Chevron.

24 Yates requested in the Brushy Canyon an increase  
25 of GOR for the Brushy Canyon, and we opposed it saying that

1 it was going to relieve reservoir pressure too quickly.

2 And that's basically the circumstances behind  
3 that GOR case.

4 Q. How does that fit in with the first knowledge you  
5 had that Exxon was attempting to put your tract in a  
6 waterflood unit?

7 A. We first knew about the potential unitization  
8 from notice from Exxon in September of 1994 -- not 1994,  
9 September of 1991.

10 The sequence of events comes about that the  
11 purchase of the lease was in July of 1990. From that we  
12 had two gas wells, one in the Pennsylvanian formation, one  
13 in the Atoka formation, which were connected to El Paso  
14 Natural Gas, which had extremely high line pressure. We  
15 were unable to produce those wells into that line pressure.

16 El Paso canceled -- The contract for the gas was  
17 cancelable in December, and El Paso canceled it.

18 In November we entered into negotiations with  
19 GPM, which had a low-pressure gas line in the area. Those  
20 negotiations continued on into about February of 1991, and  
21 in February of 1991 we came to agreement. In March of  
22 1991, they laid the new lines over to the two gas wells,  
23 and approximately April 1st is when we began production  
24 into those lines.

25 A very unusual circumstance came about in June of

1 1991. In June of 1991, we received notification from the  
2 State of New Mexico that they were taking the lease from  
3 us. We had no idea why. It was a very unusual move.

4 We notified our attorneys in Artesia, Carson and  
5 Haas. They went back in and researched the information,  
6 sent a letter to the State giving them the evidence that we  
7 were in good faith in operating on the lease, and we were  
8 -- we had established production at that point in time.

9 The lease -- The State reviewed that notification  
10 and sent us back -- they reinstated us in August of 1991,  
11 at that point in time.

12 Q. At this point, with the lease reinstated and  
13 ready for you to have the opportunity, then, to further  
14 explore, develop on a leasehold basis your property, why  
15 did that not go forward?

16 A. Well, it was July of 1991, and in September of  
17 1991, we received notification from Exxon of a possible  
18 unit -- or they were going to have a technical report for  
19 this unit, they were going to have a meeting in November of  
20 1991. In October of 1991 is when my father was diagnosed  
21 with brain cancer.

22 Q. Under the time line that Exxon originally  
23 proposed for the waterflood project, what was their time  
24 line for implementation of the project?

25 A. They were going to have it implemented by June of



1 1992. So there was no chance or no -- We were pretty  
2 disturbed by these facts. At that point in time, we really  
3 hadn't seen the technical report. We were on the phone a  
4 couple times -- I was not on the phone a couple times, my  
5 father was on the phone a couple of times with Exxon,  
6 trying to find out some information about this possible  
7 unitization.

8 Q. Were you and your dad willing to go forward with  
9 your own extraction of hydrocarbons from the Delaware in  
10 the face of the Exxon effort to unitize your property?

11 A. Not with the potential unitization there.  
12 There's not any -- You can't go back in and get payout on  
13 your wells if unitization is right upon you.

14 Q. Unitization discussions commenced, then, in late  
15 1991?

16 A. Yes, we were unable to attend the meeting. He  
17 had had brain surgery and was going through radiation  
18 treatments at that time, and I was back in at a new  
19 practice in Dallas, so I was unable to attend.

20 But we were sent the technical report in the  
21 mail, which is the mystery technical report which nobody  
22 seems to know about.

23 Q. As the process proceeded, then, with regards to  
24 Premier's interest in the unit, what position did you take  
25 with regards to inclusion of Premier's tract in the unit?

1           A.   Well, once again, I started going through the  
2   technical report and reviewing facts and trying to  
3   establish some attempt of what's possible equity in the  
4   unit.

5                   I had asked Exxon what the equity formula was  
6   going to be or what they were going to propose. I was kind  
7   of flabbergasted at the extent of the report. I was a  
8   novice at it, so I did not -- I was quite taken back.

9                   Exxon would not reveal what the equity formula  
10   was. They said they would save that until everybody had an  
11   operating -- until they had an operating meeting.

12                   The reserves report which -- They did give me one  
13   clue. They did say it's going to be heavily based upon  
14   reserves. And at that time the only reserve report that  
15   I -- Well, there was not one in this report, which broke it  
16   tract by tract. But in August of 1992, when the new  
17   technical report came out, they did have a tract-by-tract  
18   reserve breakdown.

19                   And so I basically looked at those numbers and  
20   said, Well, whatever. So we'll see where the equity  
21   formula is going to come from.

22           Q.   As things finally evolved by May and June of  
23   1994, what was your position and what was Exxon's position  
24   concerning the Premier tract?

25           A.   In April -- Let me say this: In April of 1994,

1 at that operation meeting, is when Exxon revealed their  
2 equity formula, and I found it rather disturbing that they  
3 would break it down into a primary and a secondary and a  
4 tertiary reserve.

5 The initial pre-voting formulas that came out  
6 were based upon land, were based upon barrels of oil per  
7 day, were based upon cum oil, and now we were dealing with  
8 a whole different element. It was not one that was similar  
9 to what was initially published.

10 Q. When you had these discussions, with whom were  
11 you talking, with Exxon?

12 A. At that time it was -- Let me say that in 1994 it  
13 was with Mr. Mayhew.

14 Q. And what was your understanding of his  
15 responsibilities for Exxon for this project?

16 A. He was the project manager.

17 Q. Take us forward in point of time where you were  
18 requesting the deletion of your tracts.

19 A. I didn't request deletion of the tracts until  
20 after I saw the equity formula and I felt like it was  
21 unfair to us.

22 I did have hopes of Yates going back and  
23 reviewing the geology that -- at that time that Paul White  
24 and I had had. We had a meeting in May of 1994. Yates did  
25 not -- They did not care for the geology, I guess. I don't

1 know what words to use.

2 At that meeting I said, Then take me out, there's  
3 no equity there for me, there's nothing -- At that time we  
4 were dealing with a two-phase formula, which was zero-  
5 percent equity for me at the start, and I was having to  
6 contribute my tracts for nothing at all, and it was just  
7 not being equitable. It was not a fair situation.

8 I did not have time to do this primary, I did not  
9 have time to go in and test secondary.

10 I had written letters to Mr. Long in the past,  
11 saying, If you guys have got this kind of workover  
12 reserves, then fine, let's just let things be, you go do  
13 your workover, recover your capital from that, allow me to  
14 be alone and do my own.

15 Q. What if any conversations did you and Mr. Mayhew  
16 have about deleting the Premier tracts from the unit?

17 A. In the April meeting he said he would not  
18 statutorily unitize, he would not go after Premier's tracts  
19 in statutory unitization.

20 Q. And this was when?

21 A. This was actually in April of 1994, at that  
22 operational meeting.

23 Q. Summarize for the Division Examiner your position  
24 in this matter.

25 A. My position is, one of two things needs to

1     happen:

2                 We either need to be deleted from the unit  
3     because of these errors which are substantial to our  
4     property. And since Exxon and Yates have come to  
5     agreement, then perhaps they should just cut us out, go  
6     about their unit and do their business.

7                 Or, we need to go back and recorrect these  
8     errors. We need to correct the geological errors, we need  
9     to correct reserves on the EP6, we need to correct contour  
10    lines, we need to give waterflood reserves to this  
11    property. And at that point in time, when they run the  
12    stuff through the computer, then let's sit down and get to  
13    an equity formula.

14                MR. KELLAHIN: Thank you, Mr. Examiner, that  
15    concludes my examination of Mr. Jones.

16                EXAMINER STOGNER: Are you offering Mr. Jones for  
17    cross-examination?

18                MR. KELLAHIN: Certainly.

19                EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Bruce?

20                                 CROSS-EXAMINATION

21    BY MR. BRUCE:

22                Q.    Mr. Jones, what acreage does the FV lease cover?

23                A.    The FV lease covers 480 acres within our --  
24    within the Section 25.

25                Q.    All within Section 25?

1 A. Yes, sir.

2 Q. Has Premier ever drilled any well on that  
3 acreage?

4 A. No, we have not, not to this time. We have  
5 attempted several recompletions in the FV1, but we have not  
6 drilled anywhere else.

7 Q. Okay. In the FV1 only?

8 A. Correct, at this time.

9 Q. What zones?

10 A. We did a recompletion in the Penn and a major try  
11 in the first Bone Springs sand.

12 Q. Not in the Delaware?

13 A. We have not gotten to the Delaware yet. I'm  
14 actually saving that well for a potential water disposal in  
15 the future.

16 Q. Have you or -- Have you ever employed an engineer  
17 to calculate primary or secondary reserves under -- in the  
18 Delaware, under what we've referred to as Tract 6?

19 A. No, we have not. We have done some handwritten  
20 numbers, but we have not -- I would not go into court with  
21 them.

22 Q. Have you ever attempted to get financing for a  
23 well on Tract 6, to drill a new well?

24 A. I don't know why I would need financing. Are you  
25 implying that --

1 Q. I don't know what -- I mean, I don't know --  
2 Would you finance it out of your own cash flow?

3 A. Generally.

4 Q. If Tract 6 is left out of the unit, do you have  
5 any future plans to get reserves, to be a waterflood or a  
6 CO<sub>2</sub> flood?

7 A. Yes, we do.

8 Q. What are those?

9 A. Well, the consultants have looked at this, and  
10 they see potential back over to the FV2.

11 For instance, in the FV2 -- This was not  
12 something we knew before we bought the lease, but the FV2  
13 had a substantial blowout in the Delaware -- it's in the  
14 Lower Brushy Canyon -- probably one that's bigger than any  
15 of the Exxon wells.

16 Q. And you haven't attempted to recomplete that?

17 A. No, we have not, because we have another Bone  
18 Springs that may be substantial in the area.

19 Q. Now, did Exxon ever give you an opportunity to  
20 present your geology to Exxon and to the other working  
21 interest owners?

22 A. Yes, they did.

23 Q. On more than one occasion?

24 A. We met with Exxon, Paul White met with Exxon --  
25 It was in 1993, I'm not real familiar with the month. It

1 seems like it was spring or in the summertime. And we met  
2 with Tom Kane and Dave Cantrell and with Larry Long at that  
3 meeting. There was no other operational people at that  
4 meeting.

5 Q. Have any other working interest owners within the  
6 proposed unit supported your geology?

7 A. We have not gone to anybody else except for in  
8 the May meeting when Yates was there.

9 Q. Did Yates agree with your geology?

10 A. D'Nese Fly did not agree with the geology.

11 Q. Have you looked at the unit agreement? Have you  
12 read it?

13 A. Yes, I have.

14 Q. Now, does that participation formula, the equity  
15 formula, offer value to remaining primary for developed  
16 oils?

17 A. Are you talking about on our tracts?

18 Q. On any tract.

19 A. Additional --

20 Q. If you drilled a well and you had remaining  
21 primary, would you be given credit for that remaining  
22 primary?

23 A. Not in the technical report; there would have to  
24 be a change. I'm not following your --

25 Q. If you drilled a well and completed it in the



1 Delaware and it was productive --

2 A. Correct.

3 Q. -- under the participation formula, would you be  
4 given credit?

5 A. Yes, I would.

6 Q. And does the unit agreement, or the unit  
7 agreement and unit operating agreement, provide for  
8 investment equalization that assigns value to previous  
9 investments before the institution of the unit?

10 A. It does, but it's one that I don't agree with.

11 Q. But nonetheless, if you had developed your  
12 acreage, you would be given an investment equalization for  
13 a new well that you bring into the unit?

14 A. Correct. But that was not of any knowledge prior  
15 to May of -- I mean the April, 1994, meeting.

16 MR. BRUCE: That's all I have, Mr. Examiner.

17 EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Carr?

18 EXAMINATION

19 BY MR. CARR:

20 Q. Dr. Jones, it's my understanding that Premier  
21 acquired its interest in the property involved in this case  
22 in 1990; is that right?

23 A. Yes, sir.

24 Q. And since 1990, how many wells has Premier  
25 drilled anywhere?

1           A.    We have not drilled any wells since 1990.

2           Q.    Now, in 1991, that was the time you first learned  
3 of the efforts to unitize the Avalon-Delaware; is that  
4 correct?

5           A.    In September of 1991.

6           Q.    And at that time, you were excited about the  
7 possibility of what could happen on these properties with  
8 CO<sub>2</sub> injection; was that your testimony?

9           A.    When I received this technical report in the  
10 spring of 1992, yes, sir, I was excited about that.

11          Q.    And then you received data in August of 1992 from  
12 Exxon, and if I understood your testimony, at that time you  
13 were concerned about the credit that was being given to the  
14 Premier tracts?

15          A.    No, sir, not at that time, I was not concerned,  
16 because I was looking at the total reserves of -- versus --  
17 and this was coming from -- the only little clues I was  
18 getting from Exxon in terms of what the equity formula was  
19 going to be, but I was looking at total reserves of our  
20 tract contributed to the unit.

21          Q.    When you learned about the equity formula, that  
22 was in April of 1994?

23          A.    Yes, sir.

24          Q.    And at that time you were concerned about the  
25 values assigned to the Premier property?

1 A. Definitely.

2 Q. But not the --

3 A. And the geological pick, excuse me.

4 Q. You weren't happy with these figures?

5 A. No, sir, because they were not -- I was getting a  
6 zero-percent equity, and I was having to contribute acreage  
7 at that time.

8 Q. And you were unhappy with that, were you not?

9 A. Extremely.

10 Q. And wouldn't the way to disprove these figures  
11 have been to go out and done something on the F3 [sic]  
12 well?

13 A. We were still in the process of this unitization,  
14 and you still have got to be able to -- It's an economic  
15 issue. You've got to be able to get your capital back out.

16 Q. Wouldn't you have, if you had done something on  
17 the F3 -- FV3 well -- have additional data that you could  
18 have taken to Exxon to use, to try and get them to change  
19 the value assigned to these tracts?

20 A. I don't think they would have listened to me.

21 Q. But you didn't attempt to even acquire the data,  
22 did you?

23 A. At that point in time I had already taken myself  
24 out of the unit.

25 Q. And you haven't attempted to acquire the data

1 since that time, have you?

2 A. I still -- That's why we're here in court today,  
3 sir.

4 Q. And you --

5 A. And they're still trying statutory unitization.

6 Q. My question is, have you done anything since  
7 April, 1994, to acquire additional information, technical  
8 data, on the FV3?

9 A. No, sir.

10 MR. CARR: Thank you.

11 EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you, Mr. Carr.

12 Mr. Kellahin, any redirect?

13 MR. KELLAHIN: No, sir.

14 EXAMINER STOGNER: Are there any other questions  
15 of Dr. Jones?

16 You may be excused, Dr. Jones.

17 Mr. Kellahin?

18 MR. KELLAHIN: That concludes my presentation.

19 EXAMINER STOGNER: I believe at the beginning  
20 there were -- I'm sorry, Mr. Bruce, are there -- Would you  
21 wish to recall another witness at this time?

22 MR. BRUCE: I have one witness I'd like to  
23 recall. Probably have about 10, 15 minutes of questions  
24 for him.

25 EXAMINER STOGNER: Okay, you may recall your

1 witness at this time.

2 MR. BRUCE: We recall Mr. Cantrell, who's been  
3 previously qualified.

4 DAVID L. CANTRELL,

5 the witness herein, having been previously duly sworn upon  
6 his oath, was examined and testified as follows:

7 DIRECT EXAMINATION

8 BY MR. BRUCE:

9 Q. Mr. Cantrell, were you present listening to the  
10 testimony of Mr. Harrington?

11 A. Yes, I was.

12 Q. And did you hear him talk about Exxon having  
13 incorrectly located wells on all of its maps?

14 A. Yes, I did.

15 Q. Would you refer to Exxon Exhibit 40, what we have  
16 marked as Exxon Exhibit 40, and identify that for the  
17 Examiner?

18 A. Okay, Exhibit 40 is a portion of an aerial  
19 photograph taken of the proposed unit area.

20 Q. And this map shows the extreme northwest corner  
21 of the unit area?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. The small part?

24 A. That's correct. In fact, if you look in the  
25 technical report, in either the map section or Volume I or

1 Volume II, if you'll look at Map Number 1, it's a base map  
2 of the Pool, and what we're actually zeroing in on here, on  
3 the small photograph, is that sort of northern portion of  
4 the field.

5 Q. And Exhibit 40 that we've handed out is actually  
6 just a portion of Exhibit 40 which we have up on the board  
7 here?

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. And Exhibit 40 up on the board shows the outline  
10 of the entire unit area with all the wells in this aerial  
11 photo?

12 A. That's correct.

13 Q. So what we're dealing with is the extreme  
14 northwest portion of the unit?

15 A. That's correct.

16 Q. Okay. What does that show with respect to the  
17 location of the Yates wells just outside the unit in  
18 Section 19, I believe, southwest quarter?

19 A. Okay, if you'll take a look at the wells in the  
20 lower part of the photograph, they're identified -- Well,  
21 the middle well is 1111, which, if you'll refer to the base  
22 map, is the EP7. Below that, the 1311, which is the EP5.  
23 And then just to the right of that is the 1313, the EP8.

24 The wells above the EP7, the 1111, include the  
25 two wells Mr. Harrington referred to earlier, the EP2 and

1 the EP3.

2 As he pointed out, the permitted locations for  
3 these wells is to the right of where we've shown them.  
4 It's to the east of where we've shown them.

5 Q. The permitted location for those two Yates wells  
6 is actually in the southeast quarter of the southwest  
7 quarter of Section --

8 A. That's correct.

9 Q. And where is the actual location?

10 A. Well, the actual location is as we've shown in  
11 our maps; it's in the southwest of the southwest. And this  
12 aerial photo just sort of dramatizes to you that location.  
13 You can clearly see the well pad for those two wells on  
14 there.

15 Q. So Exxon in all of its reports, in all of the  
16 technical data, was using the correct well location?

17 A. This survey constituted the basis for the mapping  
18 that we did, and it's certified by a professional engineer,  
19 signed and stamped there on the bottom.

20 Q. So anything about Exxon's maps being incorrect  
21 because of incorrect well locations is hogwash?

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. So apparently Mr. Harrington is the one who used  
24 incorrect well locations?

25 A. That's correct.

1           Q.    And Mr. Cantrell, for this next exhibit if you  
2    feel more comfortable standing and pointing, perhaps you  
3    can do that, because you have about eight or nine different  
4    colors here.

5                   First, just identify what this cross-section --

6           A.    Okay, this is a cross-section in the area of the  
7    Eddy State -- Eddy FV State Number 3 well, which we've been  
8    spending so much time discussing this morning.

9                   It also shows some nearby wells in the area, and  
10   then moves out into more sort of the heart of the field  
11   where most of the production has occurred in this field, in  
12   wells that have correlations upon which we all apparently  
13   agree.

14          Q.    And your map does start down in the Brushy Canyon  
15   and go up to the Upper Cherry Canyon?

16          A.    That's correct.

17          Q.    Now, if I can, the line of interest, I believe,  
18   is this black line showing the base of the Upper Cherry  
19   Canyon?

20          A.    Yes, if I could --

21          Q.    Why don't you go to the board --

22          A.    -- just point out a couple of --

23          Q.    -- and point out where you disagree with Mr.  
24   Harrington on the FV3. And using your markers here, would  
25   you explain why you disagree?



1       A.    Okay.  Just, if I could, first, preface this in a  
2   few words of description of our methodology.

3               We -- As I stated yesterday, we started out  
4   looking at a regional stratigraphic framework, which we  
5   then tied in, using core data, extensive core data in  
6   Section 31, and the logs in the center of the field, as I  
7   said, where the production occurs, and then we worked  
8   outward from the center of the field.

9               And let me just describe this section to you,  
10   this cross-section to you, if I could, to orient you to  
11   what we're looking at here.

12              This cross-section covers a vertical interval  
13   from just below the base of the Upper Brushy Canyon  
14   reservoir and goes all the way to just above the base of  
15   the Goat Seep Reef.

16              And to orient you to the surfaces that are key  
17   here, the top of the Lower Cherry Canyon/Upper Brushy  
18   Canyon reservoir here is this dark brown line at the  
19   bottom.  And you can see that, again, the structure here --  
20   we're moving offstructure as we go to the west here.  And  
21   then above that there's the base of the Upper Cherry Canyon  
22   reservoir here, and then the other surfaces we discussed  
23   earlier.

24              What I'd like to call your attention to are some  
25   additional markers that I've correlated across -- or in

1 between these two points.

2 Q. Before you do that, maybe, with your pen, could  
3 you just write down or maybe mark roughly with a dashed  
4 line the base of the Upper Cherry Canyon reservoir that Mr.  
5 Harrington used on that map, so -- just for reference  
6 purposes?

7 A. Basically, Mr. Harrington would like to come from  
8 this point here, the base. He agrees with us in the W4, I  
9 believe, and --

10 MR. KELLAHIN: Can you give us a color code, Mr.  
11 Cantrell?

12 THE WITNESS: It's a black line.

13 MR. KELLAHIN: All right, sir. And what log are  
14 you pointing to?

15 THE WITNESS: The W4.

16 MR. KELLAHIN: I'm with you.

17 THE WITNESS: And what he would like to do is  
18 correlate the point in the W4 to this point that's colored  
19 orange in the FV3. In other words, he would like to bring  
20 that down.

21 Okay. Another quick comment in terms of  
22 prefacing this to describe our methodology. We were  
23 looking -- What I've colored on here are characteristic log  
24 signatures, fairly similarly to what Mr. Harrington has  
25 done, but we've also spent significant time -- or our

1 methodology utilized not just individual log picks, but the  
2 overall stacking patterns that you see.

3 In other words, we're looking at this whole  
4 package, certain of these beds grouped together. So you  
5 look at the overall package, look at the overall stacking  
6 sequence, to help you define what's really correlative from  
7 well to well.

8 So just to walk through this, starting from the  
9 base of -- starting from the top of the Lower Cherry Canyon  
10 and working up, we first off correlate a group of high-  
11 resistivity, low-porosity section here together, and you  
12 can see how we're thickening as you correlate that across  
13 the section from west to east, we thicken from the low  
14 structural points, along the plates of the structure, we  
15 thicken in those low structural areas and thin as you get  
16 up on the crest of the structure.

17 And you see that same pattern as you move up.

18 The next package here has some gamma character to  
19 it, and actually we've put a correlation marker here at a  
20 point at which -- an interval where we would consider  
21 probably to be a carbonate. It occurs as a low gamma  
22 marker, high-resistivity package. And you can follow that  
23 pretty clearly across that. I've colored that purple on  
24 this cross-section. Again, you can see this same sort of  
25 flattening of the sediment surface, moving from this

1 structure that we noticed down here, we're starting to  
2 flatten as we move up.

3 Moving on up, again, looking at the packaging  
4 here, you see this interval of high gamma radioactivity,  
5 and finally capped by high resistivity as you move across.  
6 Again, significant flattening.

7 Q. (By Mr. Bruce) That's the yellow line?

8 A. That's the yellow line.

9 Above that you have a very clean -- or what  
10 appears to be a very clean section, on the basis of the  
11 gamma-ray log, and this package is very consistent as you  
12 go all the way across there, that overall package there.

13 We've -- Within that, above the yellow, we've  
14 correlated another marker there that we've colored orange,  
15 and you can see how that correlates across.

16 And that leads you right up, then, into the  
17 correlation that we've indicated for the base of the Upper  
18 Cherry Canyon.

19 Q. The black line?

20 A. The black line, correct.

21 And you can see how in most wells, this base of  
22 the Upper Cherry Canyon is denoted with a very high gamma  
23 marker. You can see that here and here --

24 Q. Okay. The C5 well?

25 A. I'm sorry, correct. You can actually see that to

1 some extent in the FV3, but you can certainly see it in the  
2 C5, the C17 and the C3.

3 Q. And that's right at the base of the black line,  
4 the thicker black marker?

5 A. That's correct.

6 Above that also, I guess another point of our  
7 methodology is, we correlate from the bottom up, but we  
8 also use correlation horizons above it to sort of correlate  
9 down.

10 And you can see a very characteristic little  
11 triplet here which I've colored as -- on the porosity log  
12 I've colored it as a pink, yellow and green sort of certain  
13 character. And you can see how that little characteristic  
14 character extends from the FV3 to the C5, the W4 and so  
15 forth, all the way across the section. And that --

16 Q. That's in every well?

17 A. That's correct, that's very distinctive. And  
18 again, it argues for this pick that we've indicated.

19 One last point here. We've pointed out how this  
20 high gamma marker occurs at the base of the Upper Cherry  
21 Canyon pick. You notice in this W4 well, that gamma marker  
22 is actually missing. The point here is that because we're  
23 using this methodology, this idea of looking at stacking  
24 patterns to drive our correlation style, the fact that that  
25 one gamma marker happens to be missing here because of

1 erosion or truncation or whatever, doesn't really take away  
2 from the correlation -- validity of the correlation for  
3 that horizon.

4 Okay, if you'll look at the next exhibit...

5 Q. And that's Exhibit 42, Mr. Cantrell?

6 A. Okay, thank you.

7 Q. This is a similar exhibition, isn't it?

8 A. That's exactly right. Again, it's a cross-  
9 section that examines wells in the area around the FV3.

10 Q. More of a north-south cross-section?

11 A. More of a north-south, more of a dip-oriented  
12 cross-section, if you will.

13 And it shows the same correlation markers, the  
14 same sort of patterns that we were discussing previously.  
15 Again, starting from the top of the Lower Cherry Canyon at  
16 the base, moving up through these -- the brown markers, the  
17 purple marker. Again, very distinctive, very  
18 characteristic log pattern, very distinctive stacking style  
19 here.

20 And you can see again the flattening as you move  
21 up from the brown correlation line through the purple,  
22 through the yellow and so forth.

23 At the yellow marker you see that you're at the  
24 base of this very nice thick -- what appears to be a clean  
25 sand on the basis of the gamma ray. You can see how that

1 very characteristic thick, clean sand carries from well to  
2 well, really very easily.

3 And again, we basically have no disagreement, I  
4 think, with Mr. Middleton over in this part of the field,  
5 over in --

6 Q. Mr. Harrington --

7 A. I'm sorry, thank you. -- over in the center part  
8 of the field. It's these correlations on the west side of  
9 the field that -- And again, looking above the base of the  
10 Cherry Canyon, of the Upper Cherry Canyon reservoir, you  
11 can see this same sort of triplet that we discussed  
12 earlier.

13 Q. The Pink-yellow-green triplet?

14 A. Exactly.

15 Q. And that shows up not only in the FV3, but in the  
16 ZG1 immediately to the south?

17 A. Exactly. The ZG1 -- We keep referring to it. It  
18 is -- As you can see, looking at the log patterns here,  
19 it's a very analogous well to the FV3.

20 They annotated on this cross-section the  
21 intervals that have been completed, and you can see this  
22 open box on the right-hand side of the depth track in the  
23 ZG1. This is actually the interval that they've completed.  
24 We've already discussed what the production numbers have  
25 been from that well. As I said, we estimate an ultimate

1 recovery from this interval of the ZG1 to be on the order  
2 of 6000 barrels of oil.

3 Q. In your opinion, are Premier's geological picks  
4 for the base of the Upper Cherry Canyon in the FV3  
5 reasonable?

6 A. I don't think so. Again, as we pointed out, what  
7 they would like to do is, bring this base of the Upper  
8 Cherry Canyon, the black line inside the C10, they would  
9 like to bring -- Can you see? I'm sorry.

10 MR. JONES: That's okay.

11 THE WITNESS: They would like to bring that down  
12 and correlate that line with the red line -- the orange  
13 line.

14 Q. (By Mr. Bruce) And that would give them a  
15 substantial amount of additional reservoir?

16 A. It would give them a significant additional  
17 amount of net thickness.

18 MR. BRUCE: Thank you, Mr. Cantrell.

19 I pass the witness, Mr. Examiner.

20 EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you, Mr. Bruce.

21 Mr. Carr, would you like to cross-examine?

22 MR. CARR: No, I would not. Thank you.

23 EXAMINER STOGNER: Let's take a five-minute  
24 recess at this time.

25 MR. KELLAHIN: We're ready to go, Mr. Examiner.



1 EXAMINER STOGNER: Are you? Okay. Well, we'll  
2 cancel that, then, if you're ready to --

3 MR. KELLAHIN: I think my preference, Mr.  
4 Examiner, is, I'll leave cross-examination of Mr. Cantrell,  
5 and I'll simply call a rebuttal witness.

6 EXAMINER STOGNER: So if there's no questions of  
7 the witness -- although I do have -- I do need to bring  
8 this on the record, on Exhibit Number 40.

9 Q. (By Mr. Bruce) Oh, I would like to move the  
10 admission of Exhibits 40 through -- Excuse me, were  
11 Exhibits 41 and 42 made by you?

12 A. Or under my supervision.

13 Q. Or under your supervision?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. And is Exhibit 40 compiled from company records?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. I would move the admission of Exxon Exhibits 40  
18 through 42, Mr. Examiner.

19 EXAMINER STOGNER: Are there any objections?

20 MR. KELLAHIN: No, sir.

21 EXAMINER STOGNER: Exhibits 40, 41 and 42 will be  
22 admitted into evidence at this time.

23 Okay, I won't ask questions.

24 There will be a letter out to the District  
25 Supervisor in Artesia, come Monday, concerning the location

1 of these two wells and the authenticity of the C-101 and  
2 the C-102, and that is -- Anyway, that's all that will be  
3 said about this at this time.

4 You may be excused.

5 MR. BRUCE: I have no further rebuttal.

6 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Carr? Your turn?

7 MR. CARR: I have nothing.

8 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, at this time I'd  
9 like to call Mr. Stu Hanson.

10 EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Hanson has been sworn, has  
11 he not?

12 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, sir, he has.

13 STUART D. HANSON,  
14 the witness herein, after having been first duly sworn upon  
15 his oath, was examined and testified as follows:

16 DIRECT EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

18 Q. Mr. Hanson, for the record, sir, would you please  
19 state your name and occupation?

20 A. Stuart D. Hanson, consulting geologist.

21 Q. Mr. Hanson, on prior occasions have you testified  
22 as an expert petroleum geologist before the Oil  
23 Conservation Division?

24 A. Yes, sir, I have.

25 Q. And have you been retained as a consulting

1 geologist by Mr. Jones on behalf of his company to make a  
2 geologic investigation in this case?

3 A. Yes, I have.

4 Q. Were you present yesterday and today for Mr.  
5 Cantrell's geologic presentation on behalf of Exxon?

6 A. Yes, I was.

7 Q. Have you made an independent geologic  
8 investigation with regards to the VF3 [sic] well?

9 A. Yes, I have.

10 Q. And based upon that investigation, have you  
11 reached certain geologic conclusions?

12 A. Yes, I have.

13 MR. KELLAHIN: We tender Mr. Hanson as an expert  
14 petroleum geologist.

15 EXAMINER STOGNER: Are there any objections?  
16 There being none, so qualified.

17 Q. (By Mr. Kellahin) Mr. Hanson, I'm going to ask  
18 you, sir, to frame the issue as you see it as an expert  
19 with regards to the topic of the VF3 [sic] well. What's  
20 the issue as you see it?

21 A. The question specifically deals with the Upper  
22 Cherry Canyon reservoir potential of the borehole, how much  
23 section is to be attributed to that section based on  
24 correlation.

25 There are some questions involving its prior

1 productive history, but primarily the question is, can any  
2 workover potential or primary reserves be attributed to the  
3 well, and is there any waterflood potential in that section  
4 with regards to the well?

5 Q. With regards to your work, what conclusions and  
6 opinions did you reach on that topic?

7 A. I independently correlated the wells,  
8 specifically the FV3 and the east offsets, including the  
9 WM4.

10 It is my opinion that Mr. Harrington's and Mr.  
11 White's correlations are essentially correct. I have a  
12 little additional corroboration for that correlation.

13 Q. How do your correlations and conclusions compare  
14 to that of Mr. Cantrell's?

15 A. I see an extra 84 feet of gross interval in that  
16 Upper Cherry Canyon section that he attributes to a lower  
17 unit.

18 Q. Describe for us the method you've utilized to  
19 reach the conclusion you've just given.

20 A. I attempted to use every bit of evidence that  
21 would allow a correlation to be made that was available,  
22 and that included wireline well log curves made available  
23 to me and drilling time as recorded by an unmanned hotwire  
24 gas detector with a penetration rate.

25 Q. How did you utilize the gas detector?

1           A.    There were two pieces -- Well, first off, I  
2 plotted up the five-foot interval drilling time across the  
3 zone in question. And the reason for using that interval  
4 was so it could be correlated with the two-inch-to-the-100-  
5 foot scale with on the logs on the cross-section, for  
6 instance, cross-section B-B'.

7           Q.    This gas detector data, is that derived in  
8 connection with mud-logging?

9           A.    It is an unmanned mud-logger of a type, yes.

10          Q.    Okay. Describe what you did to correlate the gas  
11 detector or the mud log with the other well logs.

12          A.    Okay, first I prepared a drilling time plot, as I  
13 mentioned, which is our Exhibit Number 10.

14          Q.    All right, let's look at that. Describe for us  
15 what you did.

16          A.    The penetration rate recorder on the gas detector  
17 takes off each foot as it is penetrated. Every time they  
18 get to a connection, they mark the connection off the tally  
19 sheet, drill-pipe tally sheet, onto the gas recorder, so  
20 that you have reference points from connection to  
21 connection.

22                You count backward, forwards, between the two.  
23 The graph paper that it's recorded on is divided up into  
24 15-minute intervals. I used a scale to break that down so  
25 that I could read the time per five-foot interval. That

1 was then plotted on this graph paper in Exhibit Number 10.

2 Q. You identified the gas detector as being unmanned  
3 for a portion of its run?

4 A. That's the way I understand it, yes, sir.

5 Q. All right. What did you do to resolve that  
6 potential issue?

7 A. Well, there was, in the area of the drilling  
8 break associated with the zone we were looking at in the  
9 Upper Cherry Canyon and the FV3, an untested zone. There  
10 was a gas show. The question is, of course, where does  
11 that gas show come from?

12 The normal procedure is to have an established  
13 lag time from that depth to the surface, because that's how  
14 long the drilling time, as recorded on the penetration-rate  
15 graph, is going to be, as cut. In other words, no lag.  
16 Any samples, including gas samples, from that zone must be  
17 circulated up through the mud system to the surface. That  
18 period of time that it takes to get from TD, where the bit  
19 is when it cuts that section to the surface, is the lag  
20 that has to be plotted into -- that has to be corrected for  
21 in order to correlate any gas shows with any specific point  
22 in the drilling time.

23 Q. And what correction did you make for lag time?

24 A. Based on the information that was provided me by  
25 Mr. White, who had contacted the drilling contractor,

1 determined what type of mud-pump system was being used,  
2 what the pump pressure was and what the strokes per minute  
3 were, he had calculated a 15-minute lag time from that  
4 depth, which is a little above 2800 feet, to the surface.

5 Q. What else, then, do you do?

6 A. I corrected the gas show for that period of time,  
7 15 minutes down.

8 Q. Are there any other corrections that you have to  
9 make?

10 A. Only if there is a connection being made in that  
11 interval, which there wasn't.

12 Q. All right. Now, what did you do?

13 A. Then that allows you to say that that show came  
14 from this correlative part of the drilling time log, which  
15 represents the depth as drilled.

16 I correlated the drilling time also to the  
17 wireline logs and determined that the wireline logs were  
18 recording approximately seven feet deep to drill pipe  
19 measure.

20 Q. Once you've done that and verified the ability to  
21 make the correlation and in fact have made the correlation,  
22 what does it show you?

23 A. The gas show on the hotwire in question  
24 correlated to the middle to bottom of the drilling break in  
25 question, which, from drill pipe measure, went from 2774 or

1 -5 to about 2780.

2 Q. All right. Once you make that correlation, then,  
3 what's the next process in the evaluation?

4 A. Well, what other information I had available to  
5 me was some Core Lab sidewall core analyses. Now, these  
6 were percussion cores. They're shot from a gun into the  
7 wall of the bore.

8 Q. So how do you use that information?

9 A. Well, that's where we get back to the seven-foot  
10 difference between the wireline, because those core points  
11 are usually the last run on the wireline survey, and the  
12 core points are picked off of the previously recorded  
13 wireline logs. Therefore, we can very safely say that  
14 they, as far as correlating to the drill pipe, must be  
15 corrected back up seven feet in order to be able to  
16 correlate to the drilling time log.

17 There were two samples that would have been  
18 recorded in the interval of the drilling break in question.  
19 Both of them were determined to be too fractured for  
20 analysis, which is consistent with porous, not very well  
21 cemented Delaware sands. Recovery of those type sands,  
22 especially from percussion cores, is frequently very  
23 difficult.

24 They did, however, show the highest total gas  
25 readings of any of the samples recovered during that



1 sidewall coring operation, which I believe to be  
2 significant.

3 Q. Why is that significant?

4 A. Because it correlates with the gas show and the  
5 hotwire.

6 Q. All right. What do you do next? How do you  
7 integrate that information with what has occurred in any of  
8 the adjoining wells?

9 A. Based on my previous correlation, especially to  
10 the WM4 well, which that zone -- As I correlated, this zone  
11 in question correlated to a zone in the WM4 well. That  
12 zone had been perforated and treated in combination with  
13 several other zones and made a productive well from that  
14 interval.

15 Q. What's the ultimate conclusion?

16 A. Well, when added to the fact that water  
17 saturation calculations in the FV3 well for that zone  
18 suggested the zone could be productive, and the analysis --  
19 or -- and the gas shows from the Core Lab, and the gas show  
20 from the hotwire, and the fact that it is not significantly  
21 structurally low to the correlative section of WM4, and to  
22 the level of porosity in the zone, I think there's a  
23 significant chance of recovery of hydrocarbons from that  
24 zone. I think it has been inadequately tested.

25 Q. When looking at Mr. Harrington's geologic

1 opinions with regards to this issue and contrasting them to  
2 Mr. Cantrell, how would you resolve the problem?

3 A. As I mentioned earlier, I independently arrived  
4 at a correlation which essentially agrees with Mr.  
5 Harrington's. I believe that this zone correlates  
6 specifically with the zone in the WM4, which at least puts  
7 Mr. Cantrell's correlation in question with respect to that  
8 one small sand package, small but significant.

9 If you correlate that zone with the one in the  
10 WM4, it becomes very, very difficult for me to see a  
11 correlation that would put the base of the Lower Cherry  
12 Canyon as high as Mr. Cantrell has it.

13 I also have a problem with -- Let me put it this  
14 way: As far as the basic -- I understand Exxon's  
15 arguments, as far as going from the regional. There are  
16 some other things that need to be considered, though, when  
17 you're correlating in the Delaware.

18 First off, their description of the Brushy Canyon  
19 is essentially correct, and I thought very complete. You  
20 do have a low-stand deposit there, and it was deposited in  
21 deeper water. It exhibits lower depositional energies from  
22 the density currents feeding the clastic sediments,  
23 especially the sand clastic sediments.

24 As you come up to the Upper Cherry Canyon, there  
25 was a eustatic sea-level change. We're dealing with

1 shallower waters. Evidence for this would be -- There's  
2 some evidence of scour which would indicate higher energy  
3 levels of the density currents, which would be consistent  
4 with shallower water.

5           They mention bioturbation, which would be  
6 consistent with shallower water. They didn't -- I don't  
7 recall reading about anything about rip-up clasts, but I  
8 saw some evidence in some of their photographs of potential  
9 rip-up clasts in some of the cores, which would suggest  
10 shallower water and higher levels of energy in the density  
11 currents.

12           One of the things that -- What this means is that  
13 the low-stand deposit, the Brushy Canyon, would form a  
14 fairly uniform mound, and it would form a sedimentary  
15 structure which would add a structural component to  
16 subsequent deposition of the Upper Cherry Canyon.

17           Since the Upper Cherry Canyon is dealing with --  
18 in shallower water, the density currents could be expected  
19 to be more energetic. One of the aspects of density  
20 currents is that the level of energy of the specific  
21 current, the specific event -- and these are not continuous  
22 events, they are unique, isolated -- some people even say  
23 catastrophic. I don't really like using that term, but  
24 they are not a constant source of sediments, is what it  
25 really boils down to.

1           If they are energetic enough, they do not  
2 deposit, they erode and scour. At the point to where the  
3 energy levels drop to below a certain speed -- and this is  
4 an unvectored function, it is a speed -- the coarser  
5 fractions of the clastics begin to drop out of the density  
6 current and they're deposited sediments. The coarser the  
7 sediments, the more the porosity, subsequent to diagenesis,  
8 and these have not apparently been subject to very much  
9 diagenesis. The higher porosity, the better the reservoir  
10 quality. Also, the tougher it is to recover sidewall core  
11 samples out of it.

12           There's one other factor that brings to mind,  
13 especially since these are isolated events, shall we say.  
14 Each density current kind of has a little life of its own.  
15 As they come down, as will all bottom-controlled currents  
16 like density currents, previous deposition has an effect on  
17 what happens to that package of sediment. Like I said,  
18 they can scour or they can deposit as a function of speed  
19 and the coarseness of the sediment that they carry. But in  
20 this case the coarseness -- or the range of sediments in  
21 the density currents is quite uniform. What that means is  
22 that it kind of precludes a layer-cake approach to  
23 correlation.

24           Q.   Then comment directly on his rebuttal Exhibits --  
25 I think they were 41 and 42.

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. He's got a layer-cake concept here.

3 A. As you work from the bottom, that's fine. But  
4 when you get into the more energetic sections of the Cherry  
5 Canyon, you have a definite problem here, because if you  
6 cannot identify scour -- and as they pointed out earlier,  
7 sometimes that's difficult because if you look at the map,  
8 really, you are dealing with point sources of information.  
9 You actually really need to look at it in three dimensions,  
10 because that point source is a long stream of data in the  
11 borehole, and you need to analyze it stereotaxically.

12 Q. Mr. Cantrell correctly analyzed the reservoir  
13 with his rebuttal exhibits when we deal with the Upper  
14 Cherry Canyon?

15 A. I still think that their correlation is broken,  
16 and I believe that --

17 Q. How is their correlation broken?

18 A. I believe that there's an extra 84 feet in the  
19 bottom of the Upper Cherry Canyon.

20 Q. When we look at how the -- Mr. Cantrell's  
21 interpretation is displayed within the concept of a  
22 reservoir distribution for the Upper Cherry Canyon, what's  
23 your comment on that? Is it consistent with the shape that  
24 you would see for this type of reservoir?

25 A. Oh, okay. First off, I don't like thickening

1 over the tops of structures, and in one of the cross-  
2 sections I saw a little bit of that in what I would  
3 consider to be an anomalous place; whereas our  
4 correlations, the ones independently made by Mr. White and  
5 Mr. Harrington and myself, show a little bit of thickening  
6 coming off of the structure, which I would suspect.

7           Also, especially with reference to -- I believe  
8 it would have -- Mr. Harrington's Exhibit 6A, the  
9 hydrocarbon-foot map. Because of the diminished section  
10 from the correlation made by Exxon in the Upper Cherry  
11 Canyon, there was an anomalous decrease in what I would  
12 consider hydrocarbon porosity feet in the area under --  
13 acreage 6, block 6.

14           They were speaking of Delaware reservoirs  
15 regionally. Well, Delaware reservoirs are very much like  
16 their schematics which they had in their stratigraphy  
17 section. They tend to be quite uniform. If you have  
18 enough detail, you should see a little bit of knurling to  
19 the north as you get close to whatever -- the submarine  
20 canyon that provided the avenue of sediment source.

21           But in general, they tend to be very smooth in  
22 the exterior lines, because -- Well, in the low-stand  
23 stuff, they're very evenly distributed.

24           In the more energetic deposition of the shallower  
25 water deposition of the Cherry Canyon, they tend to average

1 themselves.

2           So you end up with a smooth -- The general  
3 outline of the features -- case in point, East Shugart;  
4 case in point, Parkway -- tends to be very uniform. And  
5 that particular map left a hole in the left side, on the  
6 west side, that I found quite unusual.

7           Q.   Is Mr. Cantrell's map --

8           A.   Yes --

9           Q.   -- of the upper Cherry Canyon --

10          A.   -- and then if you add the 84 feet, net 82 feet,  
11 and run through the exact same calculations by Exxon's own  
12 parameters using the dual water model, using their shale  
13 correction from the gamma-ray index and all the rest, you  
14 still -- you come up with the database that Jerry  
15 contoured, and you end up with a map that looks what I --  
16 more like what I think a Delaware field should look like.

17          Q.   And that's Mr. Harrington's map?

18          A.   Yes, which would be, I believe, Exhibit 6.

19          MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, sir.

20               That concludes my examination of Mr. Hanson.

21               We move the introduction of Premier Exhibit 10.

22          EXAMINER STOGNER: Are there any objections?

23               Exhibit Number 10 will be admitted into evidence.

24               Thank you, Mr. Kellahin.

25               Mr. Bruce, your witness.

## CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BRUCE:

Q. Mr. Hanson, does the fact that these small samples are broken increase the gas release, versus an unbroken sample?

A. That depends on why they're broken. And the problem is, is in Core Labs' notation, because many times they can't -- they don't have a sample that they can analyze adequately or put down the same description, too broken to analyze.

Q. Okay, so you can't tell?

A. No.

Q. Now, the FV3 well, who drilled that?

A. Gulf.

Q. Did they test this interval in question, this extra 84 feet?

A. No, not that I'm aware of.

Q. Did Gulf test this well in more than one interval?

A. Testing in what way?

Q. Did they complete it in --

A. Oh, you're talking about perforation -- or production testing?

Q. Yes.

A. I don't believe so, not that I'm aware of. Just



1 the one upper zone that they recovered the 5100 barrels out  
2 of.

3 Q. Okay. Did they -- After they initially  
4 perforated, did they go back and add any perforations in  
5 the Upper Cherry?

6 A. I have no information about them doing any of  
7 that.

8 Q. Okay. But they never went back in and tested  
9 this interval?

10 A. Not that I'm aware of.

11 Q. And to the best of your knowledge, Premier hasn't  
12 tested that interval either?

13 A. They have not.

14 MR. BRUCE: I don't have anything further, Mr.  
15 Examiner.

16 EXAMINER STOGNER: Mr. Carr?

17 EXAMINATION

18 BY MR. CARR:

19 Q. Mr. Hanson, you prepared Exhibit 10, did you not?

20 A. Yes, sir.

21 Q. And when did you do that?

22 A. Wednesday.

23 Q. June of 1995?

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 Q. Do you happen to know when the Eddy FV State

1 Number 3 well was drilled, what year?

2 A. I believe it was completed in 1984.

3 Q. In preparing this exhibit, you took data  
4 available on the well; that's correct, is it not?

5 A. Yes, sir.

6 Q. And then you needed some additional information,  
7 so to get that information you contacted Mr. White and you  
8 generated other calculations that you integrated into --

9 A. He had previously figured the lag time.

10 Q. You also had to contact the drilling company, did  
11 you not?

12 A. He did.

13 Q. And made inquiry about what would happen when the  
14 well was actually drilled?

15 A. He made it to get the physical parameters of the  
16 drilling operation in order to estimate a lifetime.

17 Q. So you're relying on data that the drilling  
18 company gave you about an effort they've undertaken --

19 A. They gave Mr. White.

20 Q. What we have here, in fact, is an exhibit that  
21 shows that, drilling at this depth, rock was encountered  
22 that was actually easier to drill; isn't that what this  
23 shows?

24 A. Yes, sir.

25 Q. Isn't this what's known as a drilling break?

1 A. Yes, sir.

2 Q. And in your experience, you are aware of drilling  
3 breaks that are not hydrocarbon-productive; isn't that --

4 A. Yes, sir.

5 Q. Accordingly, when we look at this, this is  
6 showing that we have easier-to-drill rock, but it doesn't  
7 tell you whether it's hydrocarbon-productive?

8 A. No, sir, it merely -- The shows suggest that the  
9 potential is there.

10 Q. And it was your testimony that it was -- this  
11 zone was inadequately tested; isn't that correct?

12 A. Yes, sir.

13 Q. Wouldn't you think ten years is an adequate  
14 period of time to run that test?

15 A. I can't be responsible for other people's  
16 operations.

17 MR. CARR: That's all I have.

18 EXAMINER STOGNER: Redirect?

19 MR. KELLAHIN: Yes, sir.

20 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

21 BY MR. KELLAHIN:

22 Q. When you take this drilling-break event in the  
23 FV3, then you compare it over to the WM4 where you have a  
24 gas show; is that what happened?

25 A. Yes, sir.

1 I have just as much reason to believe it is -- is that.

2 To make a significant, and I mean substantial,  
3 shift in a calculated water saturation, based on a  
4 production history in a Delaware well, where many things  
5 can affect the production, including everything from mud  
6 systems, drilling operations, cement job, perforating  
7 techniques, treatment techniques, levels of treatment,  
8 first the acid job, then the frac job and the rest of this  
9 stuff, considering the frac-height potential in the  
10 Delaware -- it's a very easy formation to get out of zone  
11 in -- there's all kinds of things that can ruin the  
12 production history of a well.

13 In other words, I do not consider all production  
14 in Delaware wells to be indicative of ideal primary  
15 production.

16 There's a lot of Delaware wells that have been  
17 screwed up.

18 Q. In your experience, are there Delaware wells  
19 where a major operator will drill those wells, and years  
20 later someone else come back and make them productive  
21 again?

22 A. Frequently.

23 MR. KELLAHIN: No further questions.

24 EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you, Mr. Kellahin.

25 Mr. Bruce?

## RECROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BRUCE:

Q. That brings up something. You mentioned the WM4, Mr. Hanson. Is this interval you're talking about productive in any offsetting well?

A. I believe it is. Not specific, I've only worked in that immediate area on this particular project.

Q. Would you advise Mr. Jones to re-enter this well?

A. If the economics justify it.

Q. And you haven't done any economics?

A. No, sir.

Q. Which well is specifically productive?

A. The WM4, it is one of the zones perforated. They were treated and -- all together.

MR. BRUCE: I have nothing further, Mr. Examiner.

EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you, Mr. Bruce.

Mr. Carr?

MR. CARR: I have nothing further, Mr. Stogner.

EXAMINER STOGNER: Any other questions of this witness?

MR. KELLAHIN: No, sir.

EXAMINER STOGNER: With that, you may be excused. Let's take a ten-minute recess.

(Thereupon, a recess was taken at 11:37 a.m.)

(The following proceedings had at 11:46 a.m.)

1 EXAMINER STOGNER: This hearing will come to  
2 order.

3 That's all for the direct testimony and rebuttal.  
4 I believe we're -- time for any additional comments from  
5 some people who would like to make additional comments at  
6 this time.

7 I believe at the beginning of the hearing, Mr.  
8 Bruce, you said that there were some individuals here that  
9 would like to --

10 MR. BRUCE: Yeah, there are some folks here from  
11 Unit Petroleum and MWJ, and I believe they have a brief  
12 statement each of them would like to make.

13 EXAMINER STOGNER: Are you ready for those  
14 statements? You may come forward, up to the podium, and  
15 address who you are, who you're with, who you're  
16 representing, place of residence and anything you have to  
17 say.

18 MR. HEALD: My name is Ed Heald. I'm a petroleum  
19 geologist for Unit Petroleum out of Tulsa, and we are a  
20 little over 4.5 percent working interest owner in the  
21 field.

22 I've done a fairly extensive study of the field,  
23 and we basically agree with Exxon's geology, and we are of  
24 the opinion they've done an excellent job in defining and  
25 mapping the field. They've used very detailed and thorough

1 work, and we certainly believe that we've been treated  
2 fairly and that the proposed participation formula is  
3 equitable.

4 EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you, sir.

5 Next speaker?

6 MR. HODGE: My name is Bob Hodge. I'm a landman  
7 for MWJ Producing Company, and we've been involved in this  
8 from pretty much the beginning of the formation of the  
9 unit.

10 We have two marginally productive wells in the  
11 southwest four that if they weren't going to be included in  
12 the unit -- The unit would greatly benefit us, so we're  
13 pleased to be involved in it and think that Exxon's  
14 basically done a good job of it.

15 Thank you.

16 EXAMINER STOGNER: Anybody else at this time?

17 Is there any need, or do you wish to make any  
18 closing arguments at this time, Yates, on behalf of Yates?

19 MR. CARR: I'm prepared to make an argument, Mr.  
20 Stogner.

21 EXAMINER STOGNER: And Mr. Kellahin, Mr. Bruce --  
22 Okay.

23 MR. KELLAHIN: The practice, Mr. Examiner, is for  
24 the Applicant to go last, to have the last say, and I  
25 certainly don't mind going first.

1 EXAMINER STOGNER: Why don't you go first, then?

2 MR. KELLAHIN: Mr. Examiner, we appreciate the  
3 opportunity to appear before you, and if there are things  
4 that I don't say to you, it's simply that I've forgotten,  
5 and we will want to have an opportunity to submit to you a  
6 proposed order where I can sit back and reflect upon the  
7 technical information that was provided to you. And so if  
8 I overlook an item, it's simply because that was my error  
9 and not an error of my client or any of his experts.

10 We've heard a lot of technical information, and I  
11 think perhaps the service I can perform to you at this  
12 point is to give you the legal aspects of what you're  
13 limited and required to do under the Statutory Unitization  
14 Act and under the New Mexico Oil and Gas Act.

15 Let's deal with the concept of waste. The  
16 fundamental concept that you as a regulator need to address  
17 is the waste issue.

18 I don't see a waste issue for you, Mr. Examiner.  
19 When you look at Exxon Exhibit Number 39, it gives you a  
20 clear and concise picture of the waterflood project area  
21 planned. You saw the basic premise of what they're trying  
22 to do. It's a waterflood operation in the Delaware, and  
23 what they've done is something very unusual.

24 In this particular instance, they have put a ring  
25 of 40-acre tracts around the waterflood. I find it highly



1 unusual, it's peculiar, but that's what they've done.  
2 They've used my client's tract as a buffer for their  
3 operation.

4 Dr. Boneau talked about the potential waste of  
5 hydrocarbons if they didn't take the Premier tract into  
6 play. But look at the map; that's not what it shows.

7 Under their plan of operation for the waterflood  
8 project, if you'll look where they put the last oil  
9 producers, it's set within the Yates tract, and then east  
10 of that is an injection. There's going to be a volume of  
11 oil under that Yates tract that is simply going to go  
12 unrecovered.

13 In addition, there is the Premier tract, which  
14 has no injection wells and no producing wells and no  
15 opportunity to recover waterflood reserves.

16 If the concept is to have a unit, as Dr. Boneau  
17 says, that entirely encompasses the reservoir, why do you  
18 have a unit plan of operation that stops a row short of  
19 producers and injectors? Shouldn't the plan be one where  
20 we have producers on the outer boundary, which will put  
21 producers on the Premier tract, injectors along the common  
22 lease line with Premier and Yates, and recover for Yates  
23 primary oil production and waterflood reserves that are not  
24 going to be recovered under this plan? You don't have to  
25 be a scientist to see that that's not going to happen.

1           I don't think it's a waste issue, because if you  
2 delete the Premier tracts there's nothing that precludes  
3 Ken Jones and his mom and his interest owners from  
4 developing a common interest with a CO<sub>2</sub> project. Exxon has  
5 concluded his tracts have no value, absolutely no value  
6 until it comes to CO<sub>2</sub>, and if in the event that ever  
7 occurs, there's a way to either expand this project or to  
8 have a cooperative project. It is not fair and appropriate  
9 to take his tracts from him.

10           When you look at the concept of correlative  
11 rights, and Mr. Carr and Mr. Bruce and I are accustomed to  
12 talking to you about correlative rights, but until a couple  
13 of weeks ago I had not carefully read in a number of years  
14 exactly what correlative rights is. And to paraphrase the  
15 Act, it is not only the opportunity to recover your  
16 remaining share of recoverable hydrocarbons, but it is the  
17 statutory obligation of the Division to see that you  
18 recover your proportionate share of those recoverable  
19 hydrocarbons.

20           In this instance, if you buy off on the Exxon  
21 plan, they give us nothing for remaining primary oil.  
22 Their formula is such that we get nothing for the  
23 incremental waterflood oil.

24           I have a serious problem with the weight of the  
25 book, and I think it's weighting everyone down. There's

1     apparently an incredible reluctance to change the technical  
2     book.

3             But look what happens.  When Paul White goes  
4     through the book, he finds that there are waterflood  
5     reserves in the spreadsheets that put waterflood value on  
6     the Premier tract, and yet under this system we get no  
7     credit for it.

8             They are bringing us into this unit prematurely.  
9     It's speculative, it's not even a science project to say  
10    that CO<sub>2</sub> is feasible for this project area.

11            We asked all their technical people.  You can  
12    read the book.  It's not imminent, it is not even listed as  
13    probable.  It's perhaps.  We shouldn't be forced to commit  
14    our tracts to a "perhaps" project.  There are ways to do  
15    this later.  It's premature to do this now.

16            If you insist that you need to have the whole  
17    reservoir within the statutory unit, let's put the whole  
18    reservoir in it and let's give proper value to the Premier  
19    tracts.

20            When you look at the Statutory Unitization Act,  
21    it talks about the relative value.  I invite you to read  
22    that very carefully.  It talks about the obligation that  
23    each tract within the unit must have a positive benefit  
24    from the unit.  Each tract in turn must make a positive  
25    contribution to the unit.  That concept is one of fairness

1 and equity.

2 I've given you three experts this morning, all of  
3 which have concluded that this plan is unfair and  
4 unequitable to Premier.

5 If you decide in your judgment that we need to be  
6 in this unit, we ask that you require the Applicant to re-  
7 examine the parameters used to value the Premier tracts.  
8 Therein lies your expertise, Mr. Examiner. You need to  
9 take the issue of the log analysis, determine whether or  
10 not you agree with my experts that in fact there's 82 feet  
11 of net pay that is not credited to the FV3 well. We're  
12 absolutely convinced that that's necessary. If they don't  
13 want to give us credit for that value, then leave us out.

14 One topic that was discussed today is the  
15 sequence. The sequence was that Mr. Jones and his dad and  
16 his mom had this property, and as a matter of happenstance  
17 and circumstance it has not been further explored in the  
18 Delaware. That's no excuse for them to take his interest  
19 without fair compensation.

20 Look at the sequence. In the fall of 1991 Exxon,  
21 big Exxon, is talking to little Premier, saying, We're  
22 going to waterflood this area, we're going to put you in  
23 the unit. I think that would stop any development plan,  
24 any operational plan, and you focus your intentions on this  
25 plan for unitization. I think it's reasonable and

1 legitimate to say that if there is a lack of development,  
2 it's simply because of the activities of Exxon. They  
3 started this project years ago, and here we are now, still  
4 trying to see what they're going to do.

5 I think Mr. Jones summed it up best. He looked  
6 through the technical book as a layman, he's found that  
7 he's uncomfortable with the mistakes, with the flaws that  
8 he sees in the book. A number of those mistakes are  
9 substantial, they're unrebutted, unexplained by Exxon,  
10 they've made a material change in how that reservoir is to  
11 be shaped, their own information is inconsistent with their  
12 own conclusions.

13 It's wrong to adopt statutory unitization, simply  
14 because they argue we've spent all this time and effort on  
15 it. It's not fair, it's not appropriate. We would ask to  
16 be excluded.

17 We're going to present you a draft order that  
18 would accomplish that, and we will give to you appropriate  
19 technical findings by which you can agree with us that we  
20 are not receiving relative value, and the easiest solution  
21 is to exclude this tract.

22 Thank you.

23 EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you, Mr. Kellahin.

24 Mr. Carr?

25 MR. CARR: May it please the Examiner, this is an

1 important case. It's an important case because it is  
2 really the prototype for a number of Delaware units that,  
3 if this Application is approved, will be brought forward,  
4 additional recovery will be obtained through this process.

5 As we look at the first unit, there is no dispute  
6 that Exxon is the proper party, not only to form this unit,  
7 but to operate the unit. They're proper now because they  
8 have both the financial and technical resources to make  
9 that project go. And they're going to be particularly  
10 important and clearly are the party who should go forward  
11 with this effort when we move to a CO<sub>2</sub> phase.

12 Their witnesses have told you that on a stand-  
13 alone basis, this unit itself can justify the cost of  
14 bringing a line of this carbon dioxide into the area. And  
15 when that occurs, other units, other Delaware units and  
16 their operators and their owners, will benefit.

17 If the Application is approved, it is clear that  
18 there will be tremendous benefits, tremendous benefits to  
19 Exxon and Yates, and on the record before you we submit the  
20 benefits are tremendous that will accrue to Premier. They  
21 will start immediately receiving compensation for a tract  
22 which has for many years produced nothing at all.

23 If the Application is denied, I think you can see  
24 from Dr. Boneau's testimony yesterday, there may be no  
25 project at all. New rounds of negotiations would have to

1 commence, agreements might never be reached, and if  
2 agreements could be reached and if ultimately a unit could  
3 be put together, that development and that unitization  
4 could be delayed for many years.

5 And so we're before you here today with an  
6 application springing from the Statutory Unitization Act.  
7 That Act, in and of itself, is only appropriate where  
8 parties do not agree. And when you have that situation, it  
9 is incumbent upon all the parties to come before you and  
10 present evidence, evidence that establishes whether or not  
11 the allocation formula in the unit agreement is just,  
12 reasonable and equitable, among other things.

13 We submit to you that Exxon and Yates have shown  
14 you that the allocation formula they are proposing in this  
15 particular unit agreement is just that: just, reasonable  
16 and equitable.

17 But when a case comes to you, you have got to  
18 decide the case based on the traditional basis for OCD  
19 jurisdiction; you've got to decide it on waste issues and  
20 on correlative-rights issues.

21 Mr. Kellahin says, one, waste is the fundamental  
22 issue you must address, but he simply doesn't see it here.  
23 Well, I would remind you that as you weigh the waste issue,  
24 you must look at what is in this record.

25 When you look at the record on waste, you have

1 one thing, and that's Dr. Boneau's testimony that if this  
2 acreage is not included, as we go through the life of this  
3 unit as many as 2 million barrels of oil could be left in  
4 the ground, they could be wasted.

5 That is the evidence in this case on waste, and  
6 it falls only one direction, in favor of Exxon, in favor of  
7 those who are attempting to put this unit together.

8 We then go to the correlative-rights issue. Mr.  
9 Kellahin has, after many years, read the definition of  
10 correlative rights. But it's important to know that that  
11 definition is couched in terms that say you must protect  
12 correlative rights as far as it is practicable for you to  
13 do so.

14 You don't go, and you are not required, to go  
15 back and allocate each and every MCF, each and every barrel  
16 to the exact tract from which it's produced, because that  
17 is not practicable.

18 What you're asked to do is look at the evidence  
19 available to you, and you must determine if this allocation  
20 formula is fair, is it reasonable, is it equitable?

21 And when you get to that determination, you have  
22 to look at what the geologists bring before you. And as we  
23 often see in these cases, we have as many interpretations,  
24 almost, as we have geologists. But it's clear that Exxon's  
25 presentation is supported by Yates and others. And it is



1 also clear that the geology presented by Premier is  
2 inconsistent with that developed by Exxon over many years.

3 If we look at the Premier geology, we see that  
4 Mr. Harrington believes in the FV3 well. There's an  
5 additional zone, a lower zone in the Upper Cherry Canyon  
6 that ought to be included. Dr. Jones, who admits he's a  
7 novice in this area, agrees. Let's look at that.

8 Gulf drilled and completed the well in 1984.  
9 They produced an upper zone in the Upper Cherry Canyon.  
10 They got 90 percent water.

11 And while Premier wants to come in here now and  
12 add a lower zone, they have no test, no test information,  
13 nothing that would suggest that that is hydrocarbon-  
14 productive. They have nothing that would show that this  
15 acreage is not wet.

16 Now, there's no dispute that when we -- Exxon,  
17 Yates, the working interest owners -- looked at this  
18 potential unit, they found no primary contribution from the  
19 Premier tract, they found no secondary contribution from  
20 the Premier tract.

21 But there's been one thing in this case that's  
22 been mistaken, and it is that that tract, the Premier  
23 tract, has no value. That's incorrect.

24 The tract is valuable. It will be valuable in  
25 the life of the unit, it will result in an additional two

1 million barrels of oil being recovered. And because of  
2 that, Premier has been given one percent of unit production  
3 in the primary and secondary phases. And because of the  
4 negotiations between Yates and Exxon, they will be able to  
5 come into this unit, and they should immediately be  
6 receiving a positive cash flow, because of the negotiations  
7 between Exxon and other working interest owners in the  
8 unit.

9 We submit to you that the formula that allows  
10 them to come in on that basis is fair, it is reasonable,  
11 and it is equitable.

12 Premier, however, comes before you and, according  
13 to Mr. White's testimony, would like credit for reserves  
14 that have not been developed. And he himself, in his own  
15 testimony, has stated that that approach is inappropriate.

16 What we have here, Mr. Stogner, is a situation  
17 where Premier has simply not developed data, information  
18 they could have developed during the last five years, on  
19 the FV3 well.

20 And because we don't have test information on  
21 this zone they now speculate may be productive, because we  
22 don't have that data, perhaps you feel like you may have to  
23 decide the case in the dark, if you don't have information  
24 that could enable you to evaluate that zone.

25 Well, I will tell you that because of their

1 speculation, because they're speculating something may be  
2 there, that is not an argument that should defeat this  
3 unit. What it is, in fact, is a failure on their part to  
4 meet their burden of proof.

5 And when you look at the record and you look at  
6 the hard evidence before you -- Even Mr. Hanson, their last  
7 geological witness, admits, Additional testing is needed, I  
8 can't control the operations of others.

9 The fact of the matter is, they have failed to  
10 show you why that acreage should be given a value other  
11 than zero in the primary and secondary base. They did not  
12 meet their burden of proof.

13 The record before you is clear: Waste will be  
14 prevented, two million barrels of additional oil will be  
15 recovered.

16 The record is clear that unitization is a proper  
17 conservation tool, and in this situation it allocates  
18 production in a fair and reasonable fashion to Yates, to  
19 Premier and to Exxon.

20 And based on this record, and the standards that  
21 you are required by the Oil and Gas Act to apply to the  
22 evidence before you, we submit you have but one option, one  
23 decision that you can make, and that is, you must approve  
24 the Application of Exxon in each of these cases.

25 EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you, Mr. Carr.

1 Mr. Bruce?

2 MR. BRUCE: Thank you, Mr. Examiner.

3 I second what Mr. Carr said. As a result, I  
4 won't go into as much detail on the geology. I'd only say  
5 that I believe that Exxon has presented the only reasonable  
6 geologic interpretation, and that interpretation forms the  
7 basis for the unit participation. Everyone in this room,  
8 all of the other working interest owners, invariably  
9 believes the Exxon work is outstanding, everyone but  
10 Premier. I think those other working interest owners are  
11 correct.

12 As to fairness, the participation formula in the  
13 unit agreement, we believe, provides a fair and equitable  
14 tract-by-tract participation and allocates those substances  
15 fairly.

16 Over 97.5 percent of the working interest owners  
17 have voluntarily approved the unit, including some of the  
18 smaller interest owners, including MWJ who owns a fringe  
19 tract. These owners all agree with the technical data  
20 prepared by Exxon and with the unitization formula.

21 Over 95 percent of the royalty interest owners  
22 have approved the unit, including the Bureau of Land  
23 Management and the Commissioner of Public lands.

24 If you wade through these documents, Mr.  
25 Examiner, you'll see that by acreage, the Commissioner of

1 Public Lands has 54 percent of the land in the unit. Their  
2 actual participation in the royalty is only 45 percent.  
3 They think it is fair, nonetheless. They've looked at  
4 everything; they think it's fair. These figures alone are  
5 a large indicator of fairness.

6 You know, there's an old saying that the value of  
7 real estate is based on location, location and location.  
8 The value of Premier's tract, from what they've shown us,  
9 is based on speculation, speculation, speculation.

10 They claim they want to develop their acreage on  
11 a leasehold basis. However, there's no other working  
12 interest owner in this area who believes Premier's reserve  
13 claims. And based on the life of development, I don't  
14 think Premier believes them either.

15 Premier has spent, apparently, substantial money  
16 over the last two years hiring engineers, geologists, Tom.  
17 So they've done quite a job of putting the value of its  
18 tract on paper, but not where it counts.

19 They haven't drilled, they haven't recompleted.  
20 And frankly, we believe its contention should be dismissed  
21 out of hand.

22 Apparently it's Exxon's fault for not drilling a  
23 well in Tract 6. But as Mr. Jones said, that well, that  
24 lease, the FV lease, covers 480 acres. They've never  
25 drilled a well on that lease, never. It's not Exxon's

1     fault that they can't drill a well.

2             I'd second what Mr. Carr said about Premier's  
3     tract. They claim it has no value. That's incorrect.  
4     Premier starts off immediately with a one-percent working  
5     interest in this matter, despite having no primary and no  
6     secondary reserves. There are no waterflood injectors for  
7     this tract, therefore no secondary reserves. They haven't  
8     bothered to go out and prove the primary on this tract, the  
9     speculative primary.

10            We think they will have immediate, positive cash  
11     flow, as Mr. Carr said.

12            Once again, leaving Tract 6 out of the unit will  
13     adversely affect the Commissioner of Public Lands. The  
14     State Land Office is currently receiving no income out of  
15     Tract 6, no return on its assets, because Premier hasn't  
16     developed that tract. Deleting Tract 6 from the unit will  
17     only ensure that that situation continues.

18            Mr. Kellahin called this unitization "peculiar".  
19     I call it "different", I'd agree with that. That's because  
20     this is, as Dave Boneau said, one of the first Delaware  
21     floods, maybe the first, in New Mexico. It will certainly  
22     be the first CO<sub>2</sub> flood. There aren't -- It would also be  
23     an example of a Delaware waterflood in this area. It is  
24     important for this area.

25            The aim of statutory unitization is to increase

1 recoverable reserves, and there's no doubt from the  
2 evidence presented that this Application will do that.

3 Deleting Premier's tract from the unit will cause  
4 waste when CO<sub>2</sub> flooding commences, because the tertiary  
5 reserves under that tract will not be recovered. So you  
6 have to look at that tract.

7 But Dave Boneau also said, It doesn't only affect  
8 the tertiary reserves under Premier's tract; Yates alone,  
9 under its tract, will lose a couple million barrels of  
10 tertiary reserves. So it has a direct effect on a number  
11 of people in the proposed unit.

12 We think, and we concur with Mr. Carr's  
13 statement, that the OCD should go ahead and approve this  
14 unit. The OCD, ever since I've been around, has always  
15 encouraged unitization and should continue to do so by  
16 approving these Applications.

17 Thank you.

18 EXAMINER STOGNER: Thank you.

19 Mr. Bruce, Mr. Carr, Mr. Kellahin -- I'm sure Mr.  
20 Bruce and Mr. Carr can collaborate -- I'd like a rough  
21 draft order on these positions. I'll let you gentlemen  
22 determine the date, what's appropriate. Just provide me a  
23 rough draft order in both cases in that matter.

24 MR. BRUCE: Would you like it on a disc, Mr.  
25 Examiner?

1 EXAMINER STOGNER: Yeah, I would, and not on the  
2 new WordPerfect. I'm not that far advanced yet. 6.1 won't  
3 go on my 5-point-whatever it is.

4 MR. BRUCE: Okay.

5 EXAMINER STOGNER: If there's nothing further in  
6 Cases 11,297 and 11,298, then this matter will be taken  
7 under advisement, and hearing adjourned, and we'll give Mr.  
8 LeMay feedback on having the hearings down in Hobbs. I  
9 personally like this room.

10 Thank you.

11 (Thereupon, these proceedings were concluded at  
12 12:13 p.m.)

13 \* \* \*

14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 *that portion of these  
proceedings so  
designated*

22 do hereby certify that the foregoing is  
a correct record of the ~~proceedings~~ in  
the examiner hearing of Case Nos. 11297/11298  
23 heard by me on 22 June 1995.

24  Examiner  
25 Oil Conservation Division




## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

STATE OF NEW MEXICO    )  
                                  )   ss.  
COUNTY OF SANTA FE    )

I, Steven T. Brenner, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public, HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing transcript, Volume II, of proceedings before the Oil Conservation Division was reported by me; that I transcribed my notes; and that the foregoing is a true and accurate record of the proceedings.

I FURTHER CERTIFY that I am not a relative or employee of any of the parties or attorneys involved in this matter and that I have no personal interest in the final disposition of this matter.

WITNESS MY HAND AND SEAL July 14th, 1995.



STEVEN T. BRENNER  
CCR No. 7

My commission expires: October 14, 1998